LIBRARY
OF
DAVID F. WATKINS.
No. 64.

JEWISH ANTIQUITIES.

PRINTED BY W. BAYNES, JUN. BARTHOLOMEW CLOSE.

JEWISH ANTIQUITIES:

OR, A

COURSE OF LECTURES

ON

THE THREE FIRST BOOKS

OF

GODWIN'S MOSES AND AARON.

TO WHICH IS ANNEXED,

A

Dissertation on the Hebrew Language.

BY

THE LATE REV. DAVID JENNINGS, D.D.

A NEW EDITION.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR WILLIAM BAYNES AND SON,
PATERNOSTER ROW;
AND H. S. BAYNES, EDINBURGH.

1825.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/jewishantiquitie0000vari

THE

PREFACE

BY

THE EDITOR.

THE learned and worthy Author originally composed the following Treatise for the private use of those theological pupils, who studied under his own direction; and it is now offered to the public, as deserving the perusal of all who would obtain an intimate acquaintance with the sacred oracles, especially with the Old Testament; as well as of those whose profession leads them more directly to the study of divinity. Many passages of the word of God are here skilfully explained and illustrated, and many more may be so, by a judicious application of that knowledge of Jewish Antiquities, which is comprised in these Lectures. The representation made in them of the rites, customs, and opinions of the Jews, chiefly respects those which are found in Scripture; for the clear understanding of which, besides carefully examining and comparing the accounts given in the sacred code, and deriving as much light as possible from that fountain, the Author hath called in the assistance of Josephus and Philo, and, on some occasions, of the Jewish rabbies, as well as of a great

variety of other writers, both ancient and modern, who have treated concerning the Jews and their affairs. Of the rabbinical writers he had indeed a very mean opinion, both in respect to the credit due to them, as relaters of ancient facts, or of established customs and opinions; and in respect to their judgment, as interpreters of Scripture. Maimonides, Aben-Ezra, and Abarbanel, are the most eminent of this class, and almost the only persons amongst them who discover a judicious and rational turn of mind. Of Maimonides in particular it is said, that he was the first Jew who ceased to trifle, "qui desiit desipere." But even these authors, though more respectable than most of their brethren, come too late to have much stress laid upon their report of the sentiments and practices of the ancient Jews, if not supported or countenanced by Scripture, or by some other writer of more antiquity and greater authority than themselves.

Though the learned Author chose to execute his design upon the plan of the three first books of Godwin's Moses and Aaron, his work, nevertheless, doth not consist of detached remarks on the text of that writer, but of distinct and complete dissertations on the subjects treated of by him, and on some others which he hath omitted; insomuch that it is not necessary to have recourse continually to Godwin, in the perusal of the following volume; which must have been the reader's disagreeable task, had this work been a collection of short notes and observations. In one or two places, the Editor hath taken the liberty of inserting, either from Godwin or from Hottinger's Notes upon him, what seemed necessary to complete

the subject, and render the discourse regular and uniform; particularly in the chapter on the gates of Jerusalem, which, in the Author's MS copy, consisted merely of what the reader will here find on the miracle which our Saviour wrought at the pool of Bethesda; situated, as some suppose, near the Sheep Gate. Nevertheless, though it is not requisite frequently to turn to Godwin in perusing this work, for a complete view of the subject, yet if the correspondent chapters in the two treatises are read in conjunction, we shall see reason, on the comparison, to entertain the higher opinion of the industry with which our learned Author hath collected his materials, and of the judgment and skill with which he hath discussed the particular subject before him.

The Editor hath taken care all along to insert the words of the text of Scripture which occur, and which in the manuscript were only quoted by the chapter and verse. The Author might reasonably expect from his pupils, that the passages referred to should be carefully consulted; but it would have been irksome and tedious to the generality of readers, to be continually turning to passages of Scripture in order to understand the meaning of the Author's observations upon them, or reasoning from them. And the necessity the Editor was under of introducing the texts obliged him to make some small alterations in the phraseology, especially in the connective particles and sentences, and even a few transpositions, in order to introduce them consistently with the regularity and uniformity of the whole.

The references to authors, either for proof or illustration, which are very numerous, have for the most part been carefully examined, and made very particular, for the benefit of those who are disposed to consult the authorities on which the Author relies, or those writers who have treated more largely on the subject. For want of producing his authorities, Lewis's Jewish Antiquities, which are otherwise valuable, are very unsatisfactory to a man who is desirous, not only to know what hath been said, but by whom it hath been said, and what credit it deserves.

With respect to the Dissertation on the Hebrew Language, it may be observed, that the Author once thought more highly of the antiquity and authority of the Masoretic readings, and of the vowel points, than he did after perusing the ingenious and learned Dr. Kennicott's two dissertations, especially his second on the Hebrew text; by which the Author, as well as the generality of the learned world, was convinced, they deserved not that extravagant and superstitious regard, which the credit of the two Buxtorfs, and of some other eminent Hebraicians in the last age, had procured them from men of letters. Once in particular he expressed his sentiments on this subject to the Editor, and gave some general idea of his intended alteration in the Dissertation on the Jewish Language; which, it is presumed, he was prevented from accomplishing by the declining state of his health for some time before his decease. The Editor hath endeavoured to supply this little defect in some measure, by inserting a few references to, and obser-

vations from, Dr. Kennicott, and by softening a few expressions, in conformity with the Author's latest sentiments on this head.

The reader will observe some digressions, in the earlier part of the work especially, to subjects which have an affinity to those of which the Author is treating. Some of these the Editor hath thrown into notes, and might perhaps have done it with a few more, particularly in the chapter on the patriarchal government. As most of these relate to illustrations of Scripture, the Author was willing to indulge himself in them; declaring to his pupils, that he never thought himself out of his way while he was explaining the sacred oracles. However, these digressions are not numerous, and chiefly at the beginning of the work.

Though this volume professedly treats of the subjects which are contained in the three first books of Godwin, yet several things are occasionally introduced relative to the subjects of his three last books; which was one reason why the Author did not proceed to the particular consideration of them. Another was, that the three first books comprise all the subjects which relate to the sacred or ecclesiastical antiquities of the Hebrews, and which are peculiarly requisite to the understanding of the Jewish, and, consequently, in some measure, of the Christian scheme of theology.

This piece of Godwin, styled Moses and Aaron, the method of which our Author chose to follow, hath been annotated and commented upon by a variety of authors. One of the most judicious, who have favoured the public with their lucubrations, is Hottinger. There are two

sets of annotations in manuscript, one by the learned Witsius, which he read to his students in the university of Leyden; a copy of which was in the hands of Dr. Jennings, who hath been, in a few instances, and but in a few, beholden to it. Another annotator, whose performance is yet in manuscript, was the late Mr. Samuel Jones, of Tewkesbury. His work, of which there are several copies extant, is written in neat Latin, and contains very valuable remarks, which discover his great learning and accurate knowledge of his subject. From this writer the Editor hath inserted a note at page 380, and in a few other places. Dr. Jennings never saw Mr. Jones's Annotations, though there is a similarity in a few of their observations, they having both been in possession of a copy of Witsius. But the Doctor's own work surpasses the performances of both these learned writers, as in some other respects, so particularly in compass and variety, and as it contains the opinions and improvements of later authors: and it is hoped will answer the end for which it was originally composed, and is now published,—the advancement of religion and learning, and the knowledge of those oracles of God, which are able to make us wise to salvation.

PHILIP FURNEAUX.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.

CONCERNING PERSONS.

CHAP. I.

Of the Form of the Hebrew Commonwealth ..... Page 1

CHAP. II.

Of the Publicans and Taxes 55

CHAP. III.

Israelites and Proselytes 67

CHAP. IV.

Of their Kings 111

CHAP. V.

Of the High-priests, Priests, Levites, and Nethinim 129

CHAP. VI.

Of the Prophets 234

CHAP. VII.

Of the title Rabbi 279

CHAP. VIII.

Page
Of the Nazarites and Rechabites 285

CHAP. IX.

Of the Assideans and Karraites 296

CHAP. X.

Of the Pharisees 301

CHAP. XI.

Of the Sadducees and Samaritans 314

CHAP. XII.

Of the Essenes 320

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Gaulonites and Herodians 327

BOOK II.

CONCERNING PLACES.

CHAP. I.

Of the Tabernacle and Temple 333

CHAP. II.

Of the Synagogues, Schools, and Houses of Prayer 363

CHAP. III.

Of the Gates of Jerusalem, and of the Temple 384

CHAP. IV.

Page

Of the Groves and High Places 391

CHAP. V.

Of the Cities of Refuge 397

BOOK III.

CONCERNING TIMES.

CHAP. I.

Of Days, Hours, Weeks, and Years 401

CHAP. II.

Of their Feasts 418

CHAP. III.

Of the Sabbath 428

CHAP. IV.

Of the Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread 448

CHAP. V.

Of the Feast of Pentecost 483

CHAP. VI.

Of the Feast of Tabernacles 490

CHAP. VII.

Of the Feast of Trumpets, and New Moons 501

CHAP. VIII.

Page
Of the Day of Expiation 510

CHAP. IX.

Of the Sabbatical Year, or Seventh Year's Rest 527

CHAP. X.

The Jubilee 537

CHAP. XI.

The Feasts of Purim and of Dedication 544

APPENDIX.

Concerning the Language of the Jews 551

JEWISH ANTIQUITIES.

BOOK I.

CONCERNING PERSONS.

JEWISH ANTIQUITIES.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE FORM OF THE HEBREW COMMONWEALTH.

THE ancient state and form of the Hebrew government may be distinguished into patriarchal and special. The patriarchal universally prevailed in the first ages. By special we mean the government peculiar to the people of Israel, from the time of their entrance into Egypt to the end of their polity.

Of the Patriarchal Form of Government.

I. The patriarchal form (so called from πατρια, *familia*, and αρχων, *princeps*) is defined by Godwin to consist, in "the fathers of families, and their first-born after them, exercising all kinds of ecclesiastical and civil authority in their respective households; blessing, cursing, casting out of doors, disinheriting, and punishing with death."

It is natural to suppose, that Adam, the father of all mankind, would be considered as supreme amongst them, and have special honour paid him, as long as he lived; and that when his posterity separated into distinct families and tribes, their respective fathers would be acknowledged by them as their princes. For as they could not, in any tolerable manner, live together without some kind of government, and no government can subsist without some head in whom the executive power is lodged, whom were the children so likely, after they grew up, to acknowledge in this capacity, as their father, to whose authority they had been used to submit in their early years? And hence those, who were at first only acknowledged as kings over their own households, grew insensibly into mo-

narchs of larger communities, by claiming the same authority over the families which branched out from them, as they had exercised over their own. However, the proper patriarchal government is supposed to have continued among the people of God until the time of the Israelites dwelling in Egypt; for then we have the first intimation of a different form of government among them.

Our author hath perhaps assigned greater authority to the patriarchs than they reasonably could or did claim and exercise; at least, the instances he produces to prove they were ordinarily invested with such a despotic power, "*in civilibus et sacris*," as he ascribes to them, are not sufficiently convincing.

That there was some civil government in the first ages, is supposed to appear from the history of Cain, who was not only banished, but was apprehensive he should be punished with death, for the murder of his brother Abel. "And Cain said unto the Lord, My punishment is greater than I can bear. Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth; and from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me;" Gen. iv. 13, 14. Where אדמה *adhamah*, which we render, the earth, may signify his native country, viz. that part of the world where Adam dwelt, where himself was born, and where his nearest kindred and acquaintance lived: this word, as well as ארץ *arets*, being frequently applied to a particular country, as to the land of Canaan, Gen. xxviii. 11; to the land of Egypt, Exod. viii. 17; and to several others.*

By "the face of God from which he was hid," or banished, is properly meant what the Jews called the Shechinah, a shining light or glory, in which God was wont to manifest his presence, and to present himself as a visible object of worship, and from which he gave oracles, as he did afterward in the Jewish tabernacle over the mercy-seat; though St. Chrysostom understands his being "hid from the face of God," of the Divine Being's withdrawing his gracious presence from him, and putting him from under his protection.

* Vid. Stockii Clav. in verb.

Many have thought, that upon his being thus banished from the divine presence, he turned idolater, and set up the worship of the sun, as the best resemblance of the Shechinah, or visible divine glory; and thus they account for the early introduction of that most general and most ancient kind of idolatry.

The reason why this lighter punishment of banishment was inflicted on him, instead of that severer one of death, which his crime had merited, is supposed to be either, first, that he might continue a living example of divine vengeance, in order to deter others from the like crime, whereas had he been put to death, the criminal and his punishment might soon have been forgotten: or, secondly, as Grotius conceives, because there being yet but few inhabitants in the world, it was fit he should be suffered to live for the propagation of the species; or at least an example of severity was less requisite, as there were not many who were likely to be exposed to such outrages.*

However, it appears that Cain, being sensible of his deserts, was afraid the punishment of death would be inflicted on him: for he adds, "I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond on the earth; and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me:" that is, either as a common enemy, or at least as one banished and outlawed, and not under the protection of the government.

It follows, Gen. iv. 15, "And the Lord said unto him, Therefore whoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him seven-fold:" that is, as some understand it, to the seventh generation; or it may rather be a definite number for an indefinite;† and so the meaning is, he shall endure many punishments, or shall be severely punished.

"And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should slay him." Many are the conjectures, both of Jews and Christians (some of them ridiculous enough), concerning this mark. Some will have it, God stigmatized him with a brand in his forehead, to denote his being accursed; others, that he had a wild aspect, and bloody eyes, which rolled in a horrid manner. The fathers, in general, suppose, that he had a con-

* De jure belli et pacis, lib. i. cap. 2, sect. 5.

† Instances of this you have in Psalm xii. 6; cxix. 164; and Prov. xxiv. 16, and many other places.

tinual trembling of the body, so that he could hardly get his food to his mouth. This opinion is favoured by the Septuagint, which renders "a fugitive and a vagabond," στενων και τρεμον, lamenting and trembling. Others tell us, that wherever he went the earth shook under him. And another notion (as well founded as any of the former) is, that he had a horn growing out of his forehead, to warn people to avoid him. Le Clerc imagines, that God ordered him to wear some distinguishing garment, perhaps of some glaring colour, as a mark or sign upon him for his preservation; like the blood upon the door-posts of the Israelites' houses, Exod. xii. 13; or the scarlet line in Rahab's window, Josh. ii. 18; for had he been clothed only with the skins of wild beasts, as in those days men generally were, after the fashion of their first parents, Gen. iii. 21, he would have been very liable, whenever he had wandered in the woods and thickets, to have been shot at by some hunter, and perhaps killed through mistake. A similar instance you have in the fable of Cephalus and Procis.

However, Dr. Shuckford's opinion is the most probable, who renders the words וישם יהוה לקין אות *vejasem Jehovah lecain oth*, "God gave to Cain a sign," or token, probably by some apparent miracle, that he would providentially protect him; so that none that met him should kill him.* In this sense the word אות *oth* is used when the rainbow is called the אות *oth*, that is, the sign or token of the covenant which God made with Noah; whereby he assured him, that he would drown the world no more; Gen. ix. 12—17: and when Gideon desired, that the angel would show him a sign, or some miraculous token, that he brought him a commission from God, and that he should be able to destroy the Midianites; Judges vi. 17: see also Psalm lxxxvi. 17.

Another article in the history of the antediluvian ages, which is supposed to intimate that there was a civil government then subsisting, is the story of Lamech. "Lamech said unto his wives, Adah and Zillah, Hear my voice; ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech: for I have slain a man unto my wounding, and a young man to my hurt. If Cain shall be avenged seven-fold, truly Lamech seventy and seven-

* Shuckford's Connect. vol. i. p. 8.

fold;" Gen. iv. 23, 24. This speech, which is introduced without any connexion with the preceding history, has given interpreters not a little trouble. The Jewish Rabbies attempt to explain it by the help of a story, perhaps of their own invention; that Lamech, as he was hunting, being informed by a certain youth, that a wild beast lay lurking in a secret place, went thither, and unawares killed Cain, who lay hid there, with a dart; and then, upon finding his mistake, in a fit of rage for what he had done, beat the youth to death; so that Cain was the man he had slain by wounding him; and the youth, the young man he had killed by hurting, or beating him. But as this story is without any foundation in Scripture, we have no reason to look upon it in any other light than as a mere fable; though St. Jerome says it was received as true by several Christians. Jacobus Capellus, in his Historia Sacra et Exotica, fancies that Lamech, being in a vapoury humour, was boasting of his courage, and what he would do if there was occasion: "I would, or will, kill a man, if he wounds me; and a young man if he hurts me." But this version offers too much violence to the Hebrew text: Onkelos, who wrote the first Chaldee paraphrase on the Pentateuch, has given us an easier sense, reading the following words with an interrogation: "Have I slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt?" and accordingly he paraphrases it thus: "I have not killed a man, that I should bear the sin of it; nor have I destroyed a young man, that my offspring should be cut off for it." Dr. Shuckford has improved this interpretation, by supposing that Lamech was endeavouring to reason his wives and family out of their fear of having the death of Abel revenged upon them, who were of the posterity of Cain. As if he had said, "What have we done, that we should be afraid? We have not killed a man, nor offered any injury to our brethren of any other family; and if God would not allow Cain to be killed, who had murdered his brother, but threatened to take seven-fold vengeance on any that should kill him; doubtless they must expect much greater punishment, who should presume to kill any of us. Therefore, we may surely look upon ourselves as safe under the protection of the law, and of the providence of God."

Having thus considered those parts of sacred history which are produced as evidences of a civil government in the early ages of the world; we now proceed to examine the particular instances alleged of that despotic power of the patriarchs, which our author ascribes to them.

The first is of Noah, who pronounced a curse upon Canaan—"Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren;" Gen. ix. 25.

It may reasonably be believed, that Noah, being the second father of mankind, had, for a considerable time, the honour and authority of universal monarch, as Adam had before him. Some insist upon it, that Nimrod was the first that drew off a party from their allegiance to Noah; and, setting up for a king, proved an oppressive tyrant. Accordingly, his being called גבר בארץ *gibbor baarets*, which the Septuagint renders γιγας επι της γης, Gen. x. 8, may refer, not to his stature, but to his power; for Hesychius makes γιγας to signify the same as δυναστης, ισχυρος, *potens, robustus*. Nimrod is expressly said to have set up "a kingdom," ver. 10; and, just before, ver. 9, "to have been a mighty hunter before the Lord." Which the Jerusalem Paraphrast interprets of a sinful hunting after the sons of men, to turn them off from the true religion. But it may as well be taken in a more literal sense, for hunting of wild beasts; inasmuch as the circumstance of his being a mighty hunter, is mentioned with great propriety, to introduce the account of his setting up his kingdom; the exercise of hunting being looked upon in ancient times as a means of acquiring the rudiments of war;* for which reason, the principal heroes of heathen antiquity, as Theseus, Nestor, &c., were, as Xenophon tells us, bred up to hunting. Besides, it may be supposed, that by this practice Nimrod drew together a great company of robust young men to attend him in his sport; and by that means increased his power. And by destroying the wild beasts, which, in the comparatively defenceless state of

* Vid. Xenophon. Cyrop. lib. i. p. 10, edit. Hutch.; Philon. Iud. de Joseph. ab initio, apud opera, p. 411, edit. Colon. Allobrog. et eundem de vita Mosis, p. 475. See these and other authors cited by Bochart in his Geographia Sacra, lib. iv. cap. 12.

society in those early ages, were no doubt very dangerous enemies, he might, perhaps, render himself farther popular; thereby engaging numbers to join with him, and to promote his chief design of subduing men, and making himself master of nations.

But to return to Noah, and to the instance which our author assigns of his patriarchal authority, in denouncing a curse upon Canaan.

Unless it could be proved, that all the patriarchs were endowed with a prophetic spirit, as it was evident Noah was, when he foretold the fate of his three sons and their posterity, it will by no means follow from the instance before us, that the authority of the patriarchs generally reached so far as to pronounce effectual blessings and curses on their children and subjects. In short, in this affair, Noah seems to have acted rather as a prophet than as a patriarch: no argument therefore can be drawn from his conduct on this occasion, to prove the extent of the patriarchal power.

Some difficulties occur in this piece of sacred history, which we cannot pass over without attempting at least to explain them.

1st. It is inquired in what Ham's crime consisted.

The history informs us, that he "saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without;" Gen. ix. 22. Now merely seeing might be accidental, unavoidable, and no way criminal. We must, therefore, suppose, there was something more in the case than is plainly expressed.

Some Jewish doctors make his crime to be castrating his father Noah, to prevent his having any more sons, lest his share in the division of the world should not be as large as he wished; which conceit some very grave authors have seriously refuted, from these words: "Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him;" ver. 24. They argue, that if Ham had performed so painful an operation upon his father, the anguish would undoubtedly have awoke him, and the criminal had been taken in the very fact.

Mr. Vander Hart, professor of the oriental languages in the university of Helmstad, is of opinion, that Ham's crime was committing incest with his father's wife. But if we may suppose the narrations of Moses to be thus disguised, there will

be hardly any depending upon a single fact he relates. The most probable, therefore, as well as the easiest account, is this, that Ham told his brethren of what he had seen, in a scornful manner. It is said, "he told his brethren without;" perhaps in the street, publicly before the people, proclaiming his father's shame with contempt and derision; the very sin to which such exemplary vengeance was afterward threatened: "The eye that mocketh at his father, and despiseth to obey his mother, the ravens of the valley shall pick it out, and the young eagles shall eat it;" Prov. xxx. 17.

2dly. It is inquired, why Noah denounced the curse, not on Ham himself, but on his son Canaan; Gen. ix. 25.

It might very likely be a reason, why Canaan is here so particularly mentioned by Moses, that hereby the Israelites might be encouraged to war against the Canaanites, who were the posterity of this Canaan; when they knew, that by a curse they were devoted to subjection and slavery; and that on this account, they might be assured of victory over them.

But as to the reason of the curse being denounced on Canaan:

1st. Some by Canaan understand Canaan's father; which is a very harsh interpretation.

2dly. The opinion of the Hebrew doctors is, that Canaan first saw Noah in an indecent posture, and made a jest of it to his father Ham. For proof of this, they allege the words already quoted, "Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him;" ver. 24. By בנו הקטן *beno hakatan*, which we render Noah's younger son (*filius parvus*), they understand his grandson. But this, also, is too forced an interpretation. For as גדול *gadhol*, *magnus*, is elsewhere applied to Japhet, to signify his being the elder, Gen. x. 21, so קטן *katan*, *parvus*, is most naturally, in this place, to be understood of the younger son.

3dly. The easiest solution of this difficulty, I conceive, is this, that what is commonly called a curse, in this place, is rather a prophecy; so that the words, "cursed be Canaan," Gen. ix. 25, would better be rendered, "cursed shall Canaan be," that is, the posterity of Canaan, who from him were called Canaanites; for the blessings which Noah emphatically pronounced upon his two other sons, related to their posterity;

as is evident from the following words: "God shall enlarge Japhet, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem;" ver. 27. Now though the Canaanites suffered for their own sins (Lev. xviii. 24, 25, and Gen. xv. 16), yet it was a present punishment inflicted upon Ham, to be informed by the spirit of prophecy, that one branch of his posterity would prove so exceeding vile as to fall remarkably under the curse of God, and be made a slave to the posterity of his brethren. Which leads us to inquire,

3dly. What is meant by his being a "servant of servants:" "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren."

This may easily be determined from the use of the like phrase on other occasions. *Sanctum sanctorum* signified the most holy place in the Jewish tabernacle and temple; and *canticum canticorum*, the most excellent song. In like manner, *servus servorum*, a servant of servants, is the basest and vilest of servants, that is, a slave; and very remarkably was the prediction fulfilled eight hundred years after, when the Israelites, who were descended from Shem, took possession of the land of Canaan, subduing thirty kings, killing a vast number of the inhabitants, laying heavy tributes on the remainder, or driving them out of their country, and using the Gibeonites, who saved themselves by a wile, though not properly as slaves, yet as mere drudges for the service of the tabernacle; and when, afterwards, the scattered relics of the Canaanites, at Tyre, at Thebes, and at Carthage, were all conquered and cut off by the Greeks and Romans, who were descended from Japhet.*

The second instance which Godwin produces of the despotic power of the patriarchs, is Abraham's turning Hagar and Ishmael out of his family; Gen. xxi. 9, &c.

When Abraham left his father's house, and came into the land of Canaan, being there *sui juris*, and subject to none, he doubtless exercised a patriarchal jurisdiction in his own family; in which he was succeeded by Isaac and Jacob. But as for his turning his concubine and her sons out of doors,

* See Philippi Olearii disputat. historico-moral. de Cham. maledict. Lips. 1707; and Apud Thesau. nov. theologico-philolog. tom. i. p. 168, Lugd. Bat. et Amstel. 1732.

when he had a child by his lawful wife, it is too common a case to be an evidence of any singular authority vested in the patriarchs, and peculiar to those ages.

The third instance is that of Jacob's denouncing a curse upon Simeon and Levi,—"Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce; and their wrath, for it was cruel: I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel;" Gen. xlix. 7.

But this might have been more properly alleged as an instance of prophetic inspiration than of patriarchal authority; it being among the predictions which, under a divine *afflatus*, Jacob delivered concerning the posterity of his twelve sons. And very remarkably was this prediction fulfilled. The tribe of Simeon, upon the division of the land of Canaan, had not a separate inheritance assigned them by themselves, but only a portion in the midst of the tribe of Judah; Josh. xix. 1. 9. And when they were afterward increased, they acquired possessions where they could, far from the rest of their brethren; 1 Chron. iv. 39. 42. And if the Jewish tradition be credible, that many of them, wanting a livelihood, engaged in teaching children, and were employed as schoolmasters in all the other tribes of Israel, it was a further accomplishment of Jacob's prophecy. As for the tribe of Levi, it was remarkably scattered among the other tribes; having no tract of land assigned it, in the manner they had, but only certain cities (with a little land about them), out of all the other tribes. See Josh. xxi. *passim*. Howbeit, as this tribe manifested an extraordinary zeal against idolatry in the affair of the golden calf, Exod. xxxii. 26—28, the curse was taken off, or rather turned into a blessing, ver. 29; for it was consecrated of God to "teach Jacob his judgments, and Israel his laws," Deut. xxxiii. 9, 10; and the Levites had the tenth of all the increase of the land assigned them, throughout all the country.

The fourth instance of patriarchal authority, which is alleged, is of Judah; who, when he was informed that Tamar, his daughter-in-law, had played the harlot, and was with child by whoredom, said, "Bring her forth, and let her be burnt;" Gen. xxxviii. 24. From whence it is inferred, that Judah, as a patriarch, was invested with supreme authority in his own house, and even with power of life and death. But to this it is objected,

1st. It is not probable that Judah should be invested with such authority, while his father Jacob was still living: much less,

2dly. That he should have such a despotic power over Tamar, who was not one of his family; for, after the death of Onan, she had returned to dwell in her own father's house; ver. 11. Nor,

3dly. If he had possessed such a power, is it likely he would have been guilty of so much injustice and cruelty, as to put her to death, when she was with child? Perhaps therefore Judah might speak only as a prosecutor: "Bring her forth, to her trial, in order that she may be burnt after her delivery." For though the law of Moses, which enacted that adultery should be punished with death, Lev. xx. 10, was not yet given, burning seems, however, to have been the punishment of that crime, which custom had established. We find it practised by the Philistines, who were not under the law of Moses. When Samson's wife had married another man, "they burnt her with fire;" Judges xv. 6. It is farther to be considered, that though Tamar had lived a widow since the death of Onan, yet she was legally espoused to his younger brother Shelah, and only waited till he was of proper age for the consummation of the marriage, and therefore she was considered as a wife, and consequently as an adulteress.

Of the Special Form of the Hebrew Government.

Having thus examined the hints of the patriarchal form of government, which are to be found in the only authentic history of those early ages, we proceed,

II. To consider the special government of the people of Israel, from the beginning of their national polity to its final dissolution. Here I shall distinguish this large tract of time into four periods:

1st. From their entrance into Egypt to their entrance into Canaan.

2dly. From their entrance into Canaan to the captivity.

3dly. During the captivity; and,

4thly. From the captivity to the destruction of Jerusalem.

I. The first period is, from their entrance into Egypt to

their entrance into Canaan, which may conveniently be subdivided into two lesser periods.

The former takes up the time of their sojourning in the land of Egypt; the latter, the time of their migration through the wilderness, from Egypt to Canaan.

First. As to the state and form of their government while they sojourned in Egypt.

No doubt, while Jacob and Joseph lived, they were their own masters, and were governed by their own laws. And though afterwards, "when another king arose that knew not Joseph," they were enslaved by the Egyptians, yet we may perhaps discern the shadow, at least, of some form of civil government still subsisting among them.

God commanded Moses to "gather the זקנים *zikenim*, elders of Israel, together, in order to deliver to them the message with which he was sent to their nation;" Exod. iii. 16. And "Moses and Aaron went, and gathered together all the elders of the children of Israel;" chap. iv. 29.

By elders some understand the judges in their civil courts; because we find this title afterwards applied to such judges, Deut. xxi. 2, xix. 12, and in several other places. But it is an objection of no small weight against this opinion, that when Moses had brought the Israelites out of Egypt, there were no such judges among them; but Moses judged all himself, to his exceeding great trouble; Exod. xviii. 13, &c. By the elders, therefore, spoken of before, during their abode in Egypt, may only be meant the wisest and gravest men in the highest esteem among them, or at most, according to Mr. Selden, the heads of their tribes.*

As for the שטרים *shoterim*, officers of the children of Israel, Exod. v. 14, which they had amongst them at this time, they seem to have been appointed, and set over them, by the Egyptians, merely for the purpose of overseeing the work they were employed in.

So that, upon the whole, we have only very dark and uncertain hints of any special form of government among the Hebrews during their abode in Egypt. But,

Secondly. The form of their government is far more con-

* Uxor. Hebr. lib. i. cap. 15.

spicuous in and during their migration through the wilderness from Egypt to Canaan.

Presently after they had left Egypt, the Theocracy was set up among them, that is, God condescended to be their king, as well as their God. The word *θεοκρατια*, formed by Josephus from Θεος, *Deus*, and *κρατεω*, *impero*, very happily expresseth that peculiar government which God exercised over the people of Israel. To them he stood in a threefold relation.

First. As their Creator, in common with the rest of mankind; and, therefore, as the Lord of their consciences, he required from them all the duties of the moral law.

Secondly. He was their God, as they were a visible church, separated from all the nations of the earth to be his peculiar people. In this character he prescribed the peculiar forms and distinguishing rites and ceremonies of their religious worship.

Thirdly. He was their proper king, the sovereign of their body politic, in which character he gave them judicial or political laws relating to government and civil life; he ordered a royal palace to be built for his residence among them, I mean the tabernacle, in which he dwelt, or manifested his special presence, by the Shechinah, as the Jews call it; that is, by a bright cloud, or glory, appearing over the mercy-seat, betwixt the two cherubim in the innermost room of that palace, Lev. xvi. 2; on which account he is said to "dwell betwixt the cherubim," Psalm lxxx. 1; and to "sit betwixt the cherubim," Psalm xcix. 1. From thence he gave forth oracles, or signified his will concerning matters of importance to the state, which were not determined by the body of written laws; Lev. i. 1.

It should seem, the common way of giving these oracles was by an audible voice. In this manner, we are expressly informed, the oracle was given to Moses, when he went into the tabernacle to consult it; Numb. vii. 89. And it may be inferred from the phrase by which the oracle is usually expressed, "Jehovah spoke, saying," or "Jehovah said."

However that was (which will be considered more fully in its proper place), it sufficiently appears, that by the oracle, or by Jehovah himself, all laws were enacted, war was proclaimed, and magistrates were appointed; in which three

things the *summa potestas*, or sovereign authority, of any state, consisteth.*

1st. Laws were enacted and promulgated immediately by the oracle, or voice of Jehovah.

Thus, when the laws of the two tables were given at mount Sinai, the voice of Jehovah was heard by all the people; Deut. v. 22, 23. But the majesty in which God manifested himself on that occasion was so very awful, that it struck them with amazement, and a kind of horror; therefore the rest of the laws were, at their request, communicated more privately to Moses, and by him to the people. Yet they were all given immediately, by the oracle, or voice of Jehovah. "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying," is the usual preface to every body or parcel of laws.

Now these laws are an evidence that Jehovah acted as their king, as well as their God, since they contain a number of forensic, as well as moral and ceremonial precepts, relating to their civil polity and government, to their magistrates and judges, their estates and inheritances, their trade and commerce, and even to the form of their houses, their food, and their apparel. God enacted all their laws, and no power was vested in any one else, either to make new, or repeal old ones.

2dly. God, as king, reserved to himself the sovereign right of proclaiming war and making peace with their neighbouring nations.

He proclaimed war with the Amalekites, Exod. xvii. 16, and with the Midianites, Numb. xxxi. 1, 2; and therefore a certain history of the wars of the Israelites, now lost, is called "the book of the wars of the Lord;" Numb. xxi. 14. Jehovah commanded, and even headed, their armies in their marches and in their battles. Thus the tabernacle, or royal tent, led their marches through the wilderness; from thence, by the rising and falling of a miraculous cloud over it, was the signal given when they should proceed, and when they should rest; Numb. ix. 17, 18. By this extraordinary appearance, or token of the divine presence, was the course, as well as the time, of their marches directed; for "the Lord went before

* Vid. Conring. de Rep. Heb. sect. vii. et seq.

them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light; to go by day and night;" Exod. xiii. 21. To these miraculous signals those words of Moses refer, "When the ark set forward, Moses said, Rise up, Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered, and let them that hate thee, flee before thee. And when it rested, he said, Return, O Lord, unto the many thousands of Israel;" Numb. x. 35, 36.

We may remark by the way, with Taubman in his notes on Virgil, that it proceeded, probably, from a tradition of this usual appearance of the God of Israel, that the heathen poets frequently represent their deities as appearing in a cloud, with a peculiar brightness in it.

Now, God himself undertaking to lead their marches, it was great presumption in them ever to march without his signal or order; and when, therefore, they would thus have marched into Canaan, Moses sharply expostulates with them, "Wherefore now do you transgress the commandment of the Lord? But it shall not prosper. Go not up, for the Lord is not among you, that ye be not smitten before your enemies;" Numb. xiv. 41, 42. Which words suggest a sufficient reason of their being sometimes defeated, though Jehovah himself was their king and general.

The whole direction of the siege of Jericho, and the manner of taking it, Josh. vi., are a further illustrious instance of Jehovah's immediate conduct of their military affairs.

3dly. God in his royal capacity appointed all officers in the state. Thus he made Moses his viceroy or prime-minister; and Joshua not only the successor of Moses after his death, but an associate with him, or his deputy and lieutenant, during his life: for so Dr. Patrick understands that order which God gave to Moses concerning Joshua, "Thou shalt put some of thine honour upon him, that all the congregation of the children of Israel may be obedient;" Numb. xxvii. 20. Onkelos, indeed, and the Hebrew doctors, understand by the word הוד *hod*, which we render "honour" in that place (but which more commonly signifies glory), the splendour which shone in the face of Moses, after he came down from the mount, part of which, they supposed, was now imparted to Joshua, in order to make him appear more venerable in the

eyes of the people. Upon which, they say, Moses's face shone like the sun, Joshua's like the moon. But they should have observed, that Moses is ordered to put some of his glory or honour upon Joshua; which cannot be understood, with any propriety, of that miraculous lustre which Moses had no power to impart, but may very naturally be interpreted of the honour resulting from his authority and post in the government, in which Joshua was now to be joined with him.

We further observe, to this purpose, that when Jethro suggested to Moses, that, for his ease in the government, he should appoint a number of inferior officers under him, he (being doubtless informed by Moses of the extraordinary constitution of the Hebrew state) did not propose he should do it without a special order from Jehovah, but that he should consult the oracle: "If thou shalt do this thing, and God command thee so, then thou shalt be able to endure," &c.; Exod. xviii. 23. And thus, likewise, when any doubt arose about the meaning of any law which God had already given; or when any case occurred which the law had not expressly provided for, Jehovah himself must be consulted about it. As in the case of those who were defiled by a dead body, and therefore could not keep the passover on the day appointed, Numb. ix. 6—10; in the case of the sabbath-breaker, Numb. xv. 34, 35; and of Zelophehad's daughters, about the right of inheritance; Numb. xxvii. 5—7. From which instances it plainly appears, that God stood in the peculiar relation to the Israelites, of their king as well as their God. When, therefore, they afterwards desired a king "to judge them, like the other nations," God says, they had "rejected him, that he should not reign over them;" 1 Sam. viii. 7. And Samuel upbraids them with this their rebellion: "Ye said, a king shall reign over us, when the Lord your God was your king," 1 Sam. xii. 12; that is, in the same sense in which the kings of other nations are their kings; otherwise, the desiring an earthly king would not have been inconsistent with the sovereignty of Jehovah, and their allegiance to him.

Since, then, Jehovah himself was the king, as well as the God, of Israel, it follows, that the priests and Levites, who were the more immediate and stated attendants on his presence, in the royal tent or palace, as the tabernacle or temple

may be styled, and to whom the execution of the law was in many cases committed, were properly ministers of state and of civil government, as well as of religion. Thus, to them it belonged to declare who were clean and who were unclean; who should be shut out of the congregation, and who should be admitted into it. The people were to inquire of the law from their mouth, and that in respect to civil as well as religious matters; and they were appointed to teach Jacob God's judgments and Israel his laws, "even all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses;" Lev. x. 11; that is, the forensic laws, as well as the moral and ceremonial precepts.

Hence we are naturally led to conceive of a double use of the sacrifices which were offered by the priests in behalf, and at the charge of the people; of which they had a share, as the perquisites of their office: I mean, that, besides their typical and religious use, they were also intended for the support of the state and civil government; inasmuch as these ministers of state were chiefly maintained by them. So that the allotments to the priests, out of the sacrifices, may be considered as designed, like the civil-list money in other nations, for the immediate support of the crown and the officers of state.

On these principles we are enabled to account for Paul sacrificing, as we are informed he did, after the commencement of the Christian dispensation, Acts xxi. 26; an action which has been severely censured by some, as the greatest error of his life. Hereby he not only gave, say they, too much countenance to the Jews, in their superstitious adherence to the law of Moses, after it was abrogated by Christ; but his offering these typical sacrifices, after the antitype of them was accomplished in the sacrifice of Christ, was a virtual denial of Christ, and of the virtue of his sacrifice, which superseded all others. Paul's long trouble, which began immediately after this affair, some have looked upon as a judgment of God upon him for this great offence. But if this action was really so criminal as some suppose, one cannot enough wonder, that so good and so wise a man as Paul was should be guilty of it; and that the apostle James, and the other Christian elders, should all advise him to it; ver. 18. 23, 24. It is likewise strange, that we find no censure ever passed on this action by

any of the sacred writers; not even by Paul himself, who appears so ready, on other occasions, to acknowledge and humble himself for his errors and failings. On the contrary, he reflects with comfort on his having complied with the customs of the Jews, in order to remove their prejudice against him and his ministry, and against the gospel which he preached, and to win them over to embrace it: "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; and this I do for the gospel's sake;" 1 Cor. ix. 20. 23.

To elucidate this point, we are to consider, that there was a political as well as typical use of sacrifices; and that though the typical ceased upon the sacrifice of Christ, yet the political continued, till God in his providence broke up the Jewish state and polity, about forty years after our Saviour's death. Till that time, it was not merely lawful, but matter of duty, for good subjects to pay the dues which were appointed by law for the support of the government and magistracy. Now of this kind was the sacrifice which Paul offered; and in this view they were paid by Christians, dwelling in Judea, as well as by those who still adhered to the Jewish religion. So that, upon the whole, this action, for which Paul has been so much censured, probably amounts to nothing more than paying the tribute due to the magistrate by law; which the apostle enjoins upon all other Christians in all other nations; Rom. xiii. 6.

From this account of the Theocracy, and of the peculiar relations in which God stood to the Hebrew nation, we may also perceive, in what sense, and how far, the Levitical sacrifices could make atonement for sin. This they are often said to do; and yet it is asserted in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. x. 4, "that it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins;" that is, sins against God as our Creator and the Lord of conscience. But, besides the typical reference which the Jewish sacrifices had to the great atonement by the sacrifice of Christ, they may be supposed to make a proper and equitable atonement for transgressions of the peculiar law of the Theocracy, or for sins committed against God, merely as king of the Jews. It is enacted in the law of Moses, Lev. v. 15, 16, that if a person "had committed a trespass, and sinned through ignorance, in the holy things of the Lord

(that is, by applying to his own private use what should have been paid to God as king, or to the priests his ministers), he should make amends to the full value in money; adding to it a fifth part more, and a ram for a trespass-offering; with which the priest should make atonement for him, and it should be forgiven him." Now, in the case of a sin of ignorance, this might well be deemed an equitable and full compensation, and so a proper atonement for the sin, or trespass. But if this, or any other trespass, was committed presumptuously, that is, wilfully and audaciously, in contempt of the divine Majesty and his authority, that circumstance rendered it a sin against God, as the Lord of conscience; for which therefore no brutal sacrifices could atone; but it is said, "That soul shall be cut off from among his people;" Numb. xv. 30.

We have only further to observe, upon this form of government, which was peculiar to the Hebrews, that as God himself was their king, so Moses was his viceroy, in whom the supreme ecclesiastical as well as civil power, under God, was lodged. By him Aaron and his sons were put into the priesthood; the royal palace, or tabernacle, was built by his direction; by him it was consecrated; he gave the nation the whole body of their laws; he was commander-in-chief of all their forces. All this did Moses by commission from God, or rather God did it by Moses. So that though the servant of God, yet, as chief among men, he is called king in Jeshurun; Deut. xxxiii. 5. For though government by kings, properly so called, was not set up till the days of Saul; yet the title was more ancient, and given to persons of high rank and great authority, though they were never crowned, never attended with royal pomp, nor invested with the regalia: in particular it was applied to the Judges. When Abimelech was made judge in Shechem, it is said, they made him king, Judges ix. 6; and when there was no judge in Israel, it is said, "there was no king;" Judges xvii. 6. Thus, in after ages, the Roman dictators likewise, to whom Godwin compares the Hebrew judges, are sometimes called kings, both by the Latin and Greek historians. It is not, therefore, difficult to account for Moses's being called king, though he was only God's lieutenant or viceroy.

But it is not so easy to account for Israel's being called Jeshurun. Some derive the word from ישר *jashar*, *rectus*, just or

righteous, and so make it to signify a righteous people. Montanus renders it *rectitudo*, and so does the Samaritan version. But it seems a considerable objection against this sense, that Israel is called Jeshurun at the very time that they are upbraided with their sins and their rebellion: "Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked," &c. Deut. xxxii. 15. It is replied, Jeshurun is the diminutive of ישר *jashar* (for *nomen auctum in fine est nomen diminutivum*), and so imports, that though, in general and on the whole, they were a righteous people, yet they were not without great faults.

Perhaps Cocceius has given as probable an interpretation as any. He derives the word from שור *shur*, which signifies to see, behold, or discover; from whence, in the future tense plural, comes ישרו *jashuru*, which, with the addition of Nun paragogicum, makes Jeshurun; that is, the people who had the vision of God.* This makes the name Jeshurun to be properly applied to Israel, not only when Moses is called their king, but when they are upbraided with their rebellion against God; since the peculiar manifestation which God had made of himself to them, was a great aggravation of their ingratitude and rebellion. We now proceed to the

Second period of the Hebrew history; which commences with their entrance into Canaan under the command of Joshua, and expires at the long captivity.

Joshua, the successor of Moses, and captain-general of Israel, was of the tribe of Ephraim. His original name was הושע *Hosheang*, Numb. xiii. 8. It was changed by Moses, no doubt by God's command, into יהושע *Jehoshuang*, ver. 16. Now since both these names signify the same, namely, a Saviour, from ישע *jashang*, *salvavit*, he hath saved; it is inquired, for what reason his name was thus changed? To account for this, two conjectures are offered.

First, that it was in order to put an honour upon him, by adding one of the letters of the name of Jehovah to his name; as God changed Abram's name into אברהם *Abraham;* adding ה to it, from his own name, say the Jews; Gen. xvii. 5. Thus יהושע *Jehoshuang* may signify *salvator Dei;* and he was made even in his name a more eminent type of Christ, who bore

* Ultima Mosis, sect. 973.

the same name with him, Jesus, or Joshua; and who is called, Luke iii. 6, σωτηριον του Θεου, "the salvation of God."* But if this reason for the change of Joshua's name be thought too cabalistical,

The second may, perhaps, be more satisfactory; viz. that the name הושע *Hosheang* comes from the imperative of *hiphil*, and signifies, save; and perhaps his parents, by giving it, meant to express their wish, that he might prove a saviour to Israel. But יהושע *Jehoshuang* comes from the future tense, and signifies *salvabit*, will save. So that Moses, by making this change, predicted and promised what his parents had wished.

Joshua had been Moses's minister, Josh. i. 1, and had attended upon him in his highest employments. When he was called up by Jehovah into the mount, to receive the two tables of the law, it is said, that "Moses rose up, and his minister Joshua;" Exod. xxiv. 13. And he is said "to stand before Moses," Deut. i. 38, not surely as a menial servant, but as his first minister; for Joshua was one of the heads of the children of Israel, and a ruler in his tribe; as were all the twelve spies whom Moses sent to search out the land of Canaan, of which number Joshua was; Numb. xiii. 2, 3. 8. He only and Caleb brought a good and true report of that land, encouraging the people to invade it, and assuring them of success, Numb. xiv. 6—9; while the other ten gave such a discouraging account of the gigantic stature and valour of the inhabitants, of the number and strength of their fortified towns, and perhaps also of the unhealthiness of their country (which seems to be their meaning in saying, that "the land eateth up the inhabitants thereof"), Numb. xiii. 32, that the people were disheartened, and inclined to make themselves a captain, and return into Egypt; Numb. xiv. 2—4. God was hereupon so much displeased, because they showed such ingratitude and infidelity, notwithstanding the many wonders he had wrought for them in Egypt, and in the desart, and notwithstanding the repeated assurances he had given them of the conquest of Canaan, that he sentenced all of them who were twenty years of age and upwards, except Caleb and Joshua, to wander in the wilderness for forty years, till they were con-

* Vid. Alting. de Cabalist.

sumed; that none of them might enter into the promised land. And as for those to whose false reports this rebellion was owing, they were all destroyed by a sudden death; ver. 36, 37. But as for Joshua, he not only lived till the Israelites entered into the land of Canaan, but had the honour, as their captain-general, to conduct them. He had before been appointed Moses's successor by the oracle, or by Jehovah himself, and had been solemnly ordained to that office, while Moses was living, Numb. xxvii. 15—23; and after his death the people acknowledged him for his successor, promising to pay him the same obedience which they had paid to Moses; Josh. i. 16, 17. However, though he succeeded Moses, as God's viceroy or lieutenant, and had the same authority, military and civil, which his predecessor had; yet, in some respects he was much inferior to him; and therefore he could not be "that prophet, like unto Moses, whom God had promised to raise up unto his brethren," Deut. xviii. 15, as the modern Jews affirm, and some Christians have too easily granted, he was. For, besides that he had not the honour of being a lawgiver, as Moses had (by whom the whole body of laws which God intended for his people, was delivered), I say, besides this, he was never admitted to that immediate and familiar manner of conversing with God, with which Moses was favoured; for "with him the Lord spake face to face, as a man speaks to his friend," Exod. xxxiii. 11; whereas when Joshua wanted to consult the oracle, he was to stand before the "priest, who should ask counsel for him after the judgment of Urim;" Numb. xxvii. 21. In both these respects, neither Joshua, nor any other prophet, was "like unto Moses;" except he to whom that prophecy is applied by the apostle Peter, Acts iii. 20—22, and in whom alone it was accomplished, even our Lord Jesus Christ.

Our author says, that after Joshua succeeded Judges. But it may be questioned, whether the judges were properly successors to Joshua, in the same office, as he had been to Moses. For, as the law had been given by Moses, and as the land of Canaan had been conquered, and the tribes of Israel settled in the peaceable possession of their inheritance, by Joshua; there seems to have been no further occasion for "a man to be set over the congregation, who might go out before them,

and who might go in before them, and who might lead them out, and who might bring them in," which was the office of Joshua; Numb. xxvii. 16, 17. As, therefore, the legislative office which Moses had possessed, expired at his death, so did the office of Joshua, as *præfectus ordinarius*, and captain-general for life, at his. Hereupon the Hebrew government became aristocratical; excepting that, in respect to the peculiar supremacy of Jehovah, it was monarchical.*

In the Hebrew commonwealth, every city had its elders, who formed a court of judicature, with a power of determining lesser matters in their respective districts. The rabbies say, there were three such elders, or judges, in each lesser city, and twenty-three in greater. But Josephus speaks of seven judges in each, without any such distinction of greater or less.† We often read in Scripture of the elders of the cities; but the number of them is not determined; probably that was left discretional. For instance, we read of the elders of Gilead, who went to fetch Jephthah and make him their captain, Judges xi. 5, 6; of the elders of Succoth, Judges viii. 14; and of the elders of Bethlehem, where Boaz lived; Ruth iv. 2. 4. 9, compared with chap. i. 1. In short, that there were elders in every city, appears from the law, directing and regulating the conduct of the elders of any city, on occasion of a person's being found dead in or near it; Deut. xxi. 1—9. Sigonius‡ supposes these elders and judges of cities were the original constitution settled in the wilderness by Moses, upon the advice which Jethro gave him, Exod. xviii. 21, 22; and continued by divine appointment after the settlement in the land of Canaan. Whereas others imagine the Jethronian pre-

* Aristocracy (so called from αριστος, *optimus*, and κρατεω *impero*) imports, that the supreme government is lodged in the *optimates*, or nobles. Such is the present form of government in Venice and in Holland. Democracy (from δημος, *populus*, and κρατεω, *impero*) means, that the supreme authority is in the people, who exercise it by persons of their own order. Such is the government of Basil, and of some of the free cities of Germany. Monarchy (from μονος, *solus*, and αρχη, *imperium*) is, when the supreme authority is lodged in a single person, as in France and Spain. The English constitution is plainly a mixture of all three, inasmuch as the supreme authority is lodged jointly in the king, the lords, and the commons.

† Antiq. lib. iv. cap. viii. sect. xiv. edit. Haverc.

‡ De Repub. Heb. lib. vi. cap. vi.

fectures were a peculiar constitution, suited to their condition while encamped in the wilderness, but laid aside after they came into Canaan. However that be, it is certain there was a court of judges and officers appointed in every city by the law of Moses; Deut. xvi. 18. How far, and in what respects, these judges differed from the elders of the city, is not easily determined; and whether they were different persons, or the same. Perhaps the title elders, may denote their seniority and dignity; and that of judges, the office they sustained.

As for the officers, שטרים *shoterim*, mentioned along with the judges,* they were, according to the account given of them by Maimonides and the rabbins, much like those whom the Roman law calls *officiales et executores*, and the New Testament πρακτορας, Luke xii. 58, who attended the court, to keep the people in order, with a staff and a whip, and to execute the orders and decrees of the judges. Josephus styles them† bailiffs or officers under the judges; and we find them, on some occasions, employed as public cryers: Deut. xx. 5. 8, 9; Josh. i. 10, 11. However, the rabbies place them next under their wise men and doctors, and above their scribes or clerks. And indeed they seem to have been persons of some consideration, by Joshua's assembling them along with the elders, heads, and judges; not to hold any court of justice, but to hear his farewell charge and exhortation before his death; Josh. xxiii. 2; xxiv. 1.

The lower courts of justice, in their several cities, were held in their gates: "Judges and officers shalt thou make in all thy gates;" Deut. xvi. 18. The gate among the Hebrews seems to answer to the forum among the Romans, and to the αγορα among the Greeks, which was the name given to any common place of resort, whether for the keeping of markets or the holding courts of judicature. In the former sense, the word gate is used, when Elisha foretels at what low rates provisions would be sold on the morrow, in the gate of Samaria; 2 Kings vii. 1. According to the latter sense, Israel is exhorted to "execute the judgment of truth and peace in her gates," Zech. viii. 16; and so in the law we are now explaining, they

* See Patrick on the text last cited.

† Ubi supra. See also Matt. v. 25, where υπηρετης is used in the same sense as it is by Josephus.

are commanded to "make judges and officers in their gates." In either sense, that is, as denoting in general a place of public concourse, the word is used, when it is said of the virtuous woman, "Give her of the fruit of her hands, and let her own works praise her in the gates;" Prov. xxxi. 31.

Each tribe had its respective prince. They are called the heads of the thousands of Israel, Numb. x. 4; and were the same, perhaps, with the twelve captains of the host mentioned in the second chapter of Numbers; and their office, therefore, related chiefly, if not entirely, to military affairs.

We read also of the princes of the congregation, who presided in judiciary matters, Numb. xxxii. 2; Josh. ix. 5; xvii. 4. These probably were the same with the Jethronian prefectures, of whom we spake before, and who are called elders, and also princes and nobles, on account of the dignity of their office; Exod. xxiv. 9. 11. They were in number seventy, as appears by the account of their institution, which we have in the book of Numbers, chap. xi. 16, 17. 24, 25; though I rather apprehend that to be an account of their being confirmed in their office, and perhaps invested with some additional authority, and endowed with some miraculous gift to qualify them for it; for we find there were seventy elders before, at the time of giving the law at mount Sinai; Exod. xxiv. 1. 9. 14.

Whether the consistory of seventy elders was a perpetual, or only a temporary institution, is a matter of dispute. The Jews, and after them Grotius, Selden, Lightfoot, and several other Christians, have affirmed, it was the same that became afterward so famous under the name of the Sanhedrim; to which even their kings and high-priests were subject. But others conceive the institution of the seventy elders was only temporary, for the assistance of Moses in the government, before the settlement in the land of Canaan; and that the Sanhedrim was first set up in the time of the Maccabees.

On the former side, the rabbies are zealous assertors of the high antiquity of the Sanhedrim; and though they allow, that its session was sometimes interrupted and discontinued for years together, especially in the times of the kings; they leave no stone unturned to prove, that the court, nevertheless, subsisted from the time of Moses.

The first argument they produce is taken from this passage

in the book of Numbers, chap. xi. 16: "The Lord said unto Moses, Gather unto me seventy of the elders of Israel;" which the Talmud interprets, that "they may be a Sanhedrim to my land;" that is, a holy, standing, perpetual council, throughout all generations. For wherever we meet with the word לי *li*, unto me, the rabbies think it signifies a thing established by God to all generations. For instance, when he says of Aaron and his sons, "They shall minister unto me in the priests' office," Exod. xxviii. 41; and of the Levites, "They shall be mine," or unto me, Numb. iii. 12; and of the whole nation, "Unto me the children of Israel are servants," Lev. xxv. 55; and when the like is said of the sanctuary, the sacrifices, the altar, and many other things; in all these cases they understand the word לי *li* to import a perpetual institution.

2dly. It is argued, that if Moses needed the assistance of such a council, much more was it requisite after his death; and it is by no means probable, that any one would presume to abrogate so prudent an institution of his, in any age after him.

3dly. We read of the elders and judges of Israel, not only after the death of Moses, but after the Israelites were settled in the land of Canaan: Josh. xxiv. 1; Judges ii. 7. Now by these the rabbies understand the seventy elders, or Sanhedrim; and to the same purpose they interpret a passage of the Psalmist concerning the "thrones of judgment," that are "set," or do sit, in Jerusalem, Psalm cxxii. 5. The like reference to the Sanhedrim they find in the title of the forty-fifth Psalm, where the Targum interprets *shoshannim*, those that sit in the Sanhedrim of Moses. And thus Dr. Lightfoot understands the expression concerning the Scribes and Pharisees, who are said to sit in Moses's seat, Matt. xxiii. 2; that is, in the Sanhedrim, which was instituted by Moses.

4thly. In order to prove, not only that the Sanhedrim subsisted in the days of Zedekiah, but likewise that its power and authority were superior to the king's, they allege the following passage of the prophet Jeremy: "Therefore the princes said unto the king, We beseech thee, let this man be put to death; for," &c. "Then Zedekiah the king said, Behold, he is in your hand; for the king is not he that can do any thing against you;" Jer. xxxviii. 4, 5. By the princes here

spoken of they understand the elders, or members of the Sanhedrim.

These are the chief arguments which are produced to prove that the Sanhedrim, so famous in the latter ages of the Jewish polity, was instituted by Moses, and always subsisted after his time.

On the other side, several arguments are brought to show, that the court of the Sanhedrim was of no higher antiquity than the time of the Maccabees, and was then first set up. The first is,

That we do not find in Scripture one word of any such high court, either in the times of the judges, or of the kings; and it is as preposterous to suppose a Jewish historian should not mention the Sanhedrim, if such a court there were in those times, as that a Latin historian should write a history of the Roman affairs without ever mentioning the Senate.

2ndly. We find, in perusing their history, that the people generally followed the king, whether in the practice of idolatry, or in the worship of Jehovah; which it is hard to account for, if such a court had then subsisted, with an authority superior to that of the king.

3dly. It plainly appears, that both the judges and the kings exercised a despotic power, and did all things according to their own will, without consulting the Sanhedrim; as doubtless they would and must have done, if such a court of superior authority had then existed: "And he said, This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you, he will take your sons, and appoint them for himself," &c.; 1 Sam. viii. 11. See also 2 Sam. x. 2; and 1 Kings iii. 16—*ult.*

4thly. It is said in the book of Judges, that "in those days there was no king in Israel; therefore every man did that which was right in his own eyes;" Judges xvii. 6; xxi. 25. But if there had been such a national court as is pretended, of superior authority to a king, or a judge, there being "no king" could not have been assigned as the reason of the people's living without any government.

5thly. The story of the Levite, who was so vilely abused at Gibeah, sending an account of his wrongs to the twelve tribes, Judges xix. 29, 30, evidently shows there was then no

such national court as the Sanhedrim; for if there had been so, to that he would naturally have applied.

Upon the whole, then, it appears most probable, that the institution of the seventy elders was only temporary, to assist Moses during the abode of the Israelites in the wilderness; and perhaps also to assist Joshua, till they were settled in Canaan; but that afterward they assembled no more, and that the Sanhedrim, so famous in later ages, was set up in the time of the Maccabees.

As for the judges, which we read of after the death of Joshua, they seem to be raised up and appointed only on particular occasions; but were not *præfecti ordinarii*, like Moses and Joshua; nor were they continued in their office during life, but only as long as there was occasion; for instance, to deliver Israel from the power of some oppressor. Only it is said, that "Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life;" which seems to be mentioned as a particular case; 1 Sam. vii. 15. As for the other judges, Godwin compares them to the Roman dictators, who were appointed only on extraordinary emergencies, as in case of war abroad, or conspiracies at home, and whose power, while they continued in office, was great, and even absolute. Thus the Hebrew judges seem to have been appointed only in cases of national trouble and danger. Othniel, the first judge, was raised up to deliver Israel from the oppression of Chusan-rishathaim; Judges iii. 8—10: Ehud, the second, to deliver them from the power of Moab, who had oppressed them eighteen years; Judges iii. 14, 15; and Gideon, on occasion of their oppression by the Midianites; Judges vi. 33, 34.

The power of the judges, while in their office, was very great; as appears from Gideon's punishing the elders of Succoth; Judges viii. 16. Though their power does not seem to have been limited to a certain time, as that of the Roman dictators, which continued for half a year; yet it is reasonable to suppose, that when they had performed the business for which they were appointed, they retired to a private life. This Godwin infers from Gideon's refusing to take upon him the perpetual government of Israel, as being inconsistent with the Theocracy; Judges viii. 23.

That the judges were not properly successors to Joshua in his office, as not being *præfecti ordinarii*, is argued,

1st. From there being no mention of the appointment of a successor to Joshua, as there was to Moses; nor any one actually made judge till some years after his death, when Othniel was raised to that office on a particular occasion.

2dly. From its being represented as so criminal a thing for the people to desire a king, and even to amount to a "rejecting God, that he should not reign over them;" 1 Sam. viii. 5—7. Now the difference betwixt judges and kings was but very little. They seem to have had the same authority and power; only the judges were never crowned, nor attended with such pomp, nor invested with such regalia as kings were: if therefore the judges had been perpetual dictators, succeeding one another regularly and without intermission, why should the people desire a king; or where was the great evil of it when they did? Was it the sole purport of their request, that their judges might have the title of kings? They had this before; for when there was no judge, it is said "there was no king in Israel." Or was it only, that their judges might be crowned, and have the regalia? This was a matter of very little moment, and hardly worth disputing about. Their desire, then, plainly was, that they might have a judge, or king, *in perpetuum*, as the stated supreme officer in the government, like other nations; and not merely on extraordinary occasions. Now this was altering the constitution and form of government which God had established; and on this account their motion was so displeasing to Samuel, and to God himself.

However, on the other hand, in order to prove the judges were perpetual dictators, and in their office quite different from kings, it is objected and argued,

1st. That Samuel had made his sons judges, 1 Sam. viii. 1; and it was nothing but the ill government of these new judges that made the people desire a king, ver. 3—5. Therefore the kingly office was different from that of the judges; consequently the judges might have been perpetual dictators, notwithstanding the people now desired a king.

But to this it may be answered, that the title judge was usually applied, not only to the one supreme officer under

God, such as Othniel, Barak, &c., but also to inferior magistrates; Josh. viii. 33; xxiii. 2, and elsewhere. Now it is not said, that Samuel made one of his sons the judge, κατ' εξοχην, that is, by appointing him to be his successor, or his partner in the government; but that he made them both judges; and they were judges in Beersheba, that is, inferior magistrates, whose office it was to dispense and execute the laws of Jehovah.

2dly. It is alleged, that the judge, κατ' εξοχην, is spoken of as a stated officer in the Hebrew commonwealth: "Thou shalt come unto the priests, the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days;" Deut. xvii. 9. Consequently there must always be a judge.

But those on the other side of the question reply, that ואל השפט *veel hassophet* may as well be rendered "OR unto the judge;" meaning, in case there should be any judge at that time. And this sense they apprehend is confirmed by its being said, "The man that will not hearken to the priest, or to the judge, even that man shall die," ver. 12.

3dly. The chasm or interregnum betwixt Samson and Samuel, when there was no judge, is mentioned once and again as an extraordinary thing, and a calamitous circumstance to the nation; Judges xvii. 6; xviii. 1; xix. 1; xxi. 25. Therefore, ordinarily, there was one supreme judge over all the other officers and ministers of state.

But it is replied, this will not prove that they had perpetual judges; but only that it was a calamity to be without a judge at a time when such an officer was so much wanted.

It is made a question, what time that was which is here referred to, when "there was no king, or judge, in Israel." The order of the history leads us to conceive, it was betwixt Samson and Samuel. But Dr. Patrick is of opinion, that those five last chapters of the book of Judges are a distinct history, in which the author gives an account of several memorable transactions which fell out in or about the time of the judges, whose story he would not interrupt by intermixing these matters with it, and therefore reserved them to be related by themselves, in the second part, or appendix. Wherein he first gives an account how idolatry crept into the tribe of Ephraim, then how it was propagated among the Danites; after which he relates a most heinous act of adultery, com-

mitted in the tribe of Benjamin; which introduces the history, first, of the almost total destruction of that tribe for their countenancing that detestable fact; and then, of its restoration. Now, on such extraordinary occasions, they should have appointed a judge, especially when the inferior officers so shamefully neglected their duty.

These Hebrew judges were in all fifteen, from Othniel the first to Samuel the last; before whose death the form of government was changed, and Saul was made king.

We may remark, that the Carthaginian Suffites, the chief officers and magistrates in that state, whom both the Greek and Latin historians frequently mention,* seem evidently to have derived their title from the Hebrew word שפטים *shophetim:* which affords one argument, among several others, of the Carthaginians being originally Canaanites, driven out of their country by Joshua; since by this it appears, that their ancient language was Hebrew, the language of the Canaanites.†

Procopius Gazæus observes, that the history of the judges is of excellent use to represent to us the mighty power of true religion to make a nation happy, and the dismal calamities which impiety brings upon it. And, therefore, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews has thought fit to propound several examples of the power of faith out of this book; as of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, and Samuel; who, being animated by this principle, did great things for their nation, and obtained signal victories over their enemies.‡

There is no affair related in this book, which has been made so much a matter of controversy, as that of Jephthah's vow; which, therefore, we shall now take into consideration.

Concerning Jephthah's Vow.

It has been earnestly disputed, both among Jews and Christians, whether Jephthah did sacrifice his daughter. And very considerable men have appeared on each side of this question. Not but if Jephthah had been a heathen, I suppose, we should

* Livii Hist. lib. xxviii. cap. 37; lib. xxx. cap. 7.

† Vid. Bochart. Geograp. Sacr. part ii. lib. i. cap. xxiv. apud Opera, tom. i. p. 473. edit. Lugd. Bat. 1712.

‡ Patrick on Judges, at the beginning.

have had no more difficulty in understanding the account given of this matter in the book of Judges, chap. xi., of his sacrificing his daughter, than we have in understanding Homer's account of Agamemnon's sacrificing his daughter Iphigenia, or Idomeneus his son, of a real sacrifice. I do not know that it is so much as pretended, that the Hebrew text will not admit of such a sense, or even that it is not the most natural one which the words will bear. But that a judge of the Hebrew nation, who were worshippers of the true God, and whose law did not admit of human sacrifices, should be guilty of this grossest act of heathen superstition, is what several of the Jewish rabbies can by no means admit; and many learned Christians, not knowing how to reconcile such a barbarous, as well as superstitious, murder with the good character which is given of Jephthah in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. xi. 32 (where his name stands in the catalogue of those ancient worthies who were illustrious instances of the power of faith), have endeavoured to soften the account of this inhuman sacrifice, and to introduce a milder sense. For this purpose the art of criticism hath been diligently applied to the Hebrew text, in order to make it signify no more than that Jephthah devoted his daughter to perpetual virginity, for the honour and in the service of God. Among the Jews, rabbi Joseph, and rabbi David Kimchi, and rabbi Levi Ben Gerson,* have espoused this side of the question; as among the Christian writers, have Estius, Vatablus, Junius, Grotius, Drusius, Heinsius, Glassius, and Le Clerc.

In favour of the milder sense, that Jephthah devoted his daughter to perpetual virginity, it is alleged,

1st. That she desired time, before the vow was performed upon her, to bewail her virginity, not the loss of her life, Judges xi. 37. From whence it is concluded, that it was not death, but perpetual virginity that she was devoted to suffer; and the reason, they say, why Jephthah was so troubled when his daughter met him, ver. 35, was, because she being his only child, ver. 34, and he now obliged by his vow to devote her to perpetual virginity, his family would soon be extinct in Israel.

But to this it is replied, that to die childless was accounted

* Selden. de jure nat. et gent. lib. iv. cap. xi.

by the Jews a very sad calamity. Hence it was denounced as a heavy curse on Coniah, the son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah: "Thus saith the Lord, Write this man childless;" Jer. xxii. 30. And therefore Jephthah's daughter bewailed her virginity, or her dying childless, more than the loss of her life.

2dly. It is alleged, in favour of the notion of her being devoted to perpetual virginity, that the words, לתנות לבת-יפתה *lethannoth lebath Jephthah*, Judges xi. 40, which we render, "to lament the daughter of Jephthah," should be rendered, as in the margin, "to talk with the daughter of Jephthah;" that is, to visit and comfort her in her recluse life. To support this sense of the word לתנות *lethannoth*, they allege the following expression in this book of Judges, "There shall they rehearse the righteous acts of the Lord," Judges v. 11; where, they observe, the verb תנה *thana* is rightly rendered, and can only mean, to rehearse.

But to this argument it is replied, that, allowing this sense of the verb, it will not at all contradict the notion of her being sacrificed; for then the meaning of this passage will be, that "the daughters of Israel went yearly to rehearse the tragical story of the daughter of Jephthah." Or even if we render the word תנה *thana*, as in the margin, to talk; yet לתנות לבת *lethannoth lebath* would rather signify to "talk concerning," than to "talk with" as אמרי-לי *imri-li*, is to "say of me," or "concerning me," not "with me," Gen. xx. 13; and יצוה-לך *jetzavveh-lak* signifies, "he shall give charge concerning thee," not "with thee;" Psalm xci. 11. And thus לתנות לבת-יפתה *lethannoth lebath Jephthah*, signifies to talk concerning the daughter of Jephthah, and not with her. So that this critique is not at all inconsistent with the notion of her being sacrificed, but rather confirms it.

3dly. The chief critical argument in favour of her being devoted to perpetual virginity, is taken from this clause in Jephthah's vow, Judges xi. 31, והיה ליהוה והעלתיהו עולה *vehaja laihova vehangnalithihu gnolath*: where, they say, the *Vau* should be understood not copulatively, but disjunctively; and then the meaning is, "Whatsoever cometh to meet me, shall either be the Lord's, OR I will offer it up for a burnt-offering;" that is, in case it should be a creature fit for sacrifice. Thus

Glassius, in his Philologia Sacra, understands it; and so Drusius, and several others; and they produce some other texts, where the *Vau* is used disjunctively; as where it is said, "He that curseth his father, or his mother, shall surely be put to death;" Exod. xxi. 17, compared with Matt. xv. 4. Again, "Asahel turned not to the right-hand, or to the left," 2 Sam. ii. 19; where the *Vau* cannot signify *and*. In like manner the conjunctive *que*, in Latin, is sometimes used in a disjunctive sense. Thus Virgil—

> Aut Pelago Danaum insidias, suspectaque dona
> Præcipitare jubent, subjectisque urere flammis.
>
> Æneid ii. l. 37.

Again,

> Saxum ingens volvunt alii, radiisque rotarum
> Districti pendent.———
>
> Æneid vi. l. 616.

Now, taking the *Vau* in this sense in the passage before us, the meaning will be, "I will devote it to God, OR it shall be offered for a burnt-offering."

But to this it is replied, that every thing sacrificed was offered or devoted to God; but every thing devoted to God was not sacrificed. Therefore it would be as improper to say, I will either devote it to God, or offer it in sacrifice, as it would be to say, *animal aut homo;* or, *homo aut Petrus:* or, I will ride either on a four-footed beast or a horse; because a horse is a four-footed beast.

Besides, in other parallel texts, where vows are expressed, like this of Jepththah's, and where the *Vau* is used in the same manner as it is here, nobody will suppose it should be taken disjunctively. As in Hannah's vow, 1 Sam. i. 11; "I will give him unto the Lord all the days of his life, and there shall no razor come upon his head;" nobody understands it thus, "I will either give him to the Lord, or no razor shall come upon his head." So in Jacob's vow, "Then shall the Lord be my God; AND this stone, which I have set up for a pillar, shall be God's house;" Gen xxviii. 21, 22.

You see, then, that the words of the Hebrew text will hardly bear any other sense than is agreeable to the more common opinion, that Jephthah did devote his daughter to death, and actually sacrifice her.

However, let us attend to the reasons which some have offered, why the text should be interpreted in the milder sense, even though it should oblige us to depart from the more natural meaning and construction of the words.

1st. Some of the Jewish rabbies seem to think it necessary, for the honour of their nation, to vindicate Jephthah's character at any rate from the blemish of murder, which, if committed, must have been a double or triple crime, as a murder, as a most unnatural murder of his own daughter and only child, and also as a heathenish rite of sacrificing, which the Lord God did by no means permit. But, surely, it is hardly worth their while to labour so earnestly, as some of them have done, to vindicate Jephthah's character for the sake of their national honour, while the lives and actions of so many of their wicked kings are on record in the sacred history, particularly of Ahaz, who "made his son to pass through the fire according to the abominations of the heathen," 2 Kings xvi. 3; of Manasseh, who "caused his children to pass through the fire in the valley of the son of Hinnom," 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6; which, if it did not mean their burning them to death, in sacrifice to their idols, was at least a rite of lustration (as the heathens called it), by which parents dedicated their children to the worship and service of their false gods.

2dly. It is pleaded, that Jephthah is not censured in any part of sacred history for what he did on this occasion, which, they suppose, if he had been guilty of so abominable a crime as sacrificing his own daughter, he would have been.

To this it may be replied, that if every action, mentioned in the sacred history without censure, must therefore be concluded to be lawful and good, many actions, which we are sure were contrary to the positive law of God, and others which were immoral in their own nature, must be held lawful. As Samson's marrying a Philistine contrary to the law, which forbad the Jews to marry out of their own nation; his lewdness with Dalilah; and his revengeful spirit, which he manifested to the last, and carried to such an extreme as to sacrifice his own life, that he might "be avenged on the Philistines for his two eyes." Another argument against the more literal sense of this history is,

3dly. It cannot be thought that God would have given

victory and success to Jephthah in his expedition against the Ammonites, upon his making so wicked a vow as this, of offering a human sacrifice.

But it is to be considered, that the private interest of Jephthah was not so much concerned in this expedition as the public interest of the whole Jewish nation; and why might not God succeed him in his war against the Ammonites, notwithstanding his faults, for the sake of delivering his favourite people, whom he had taken under his special protection, as in many other cases he hath given success to wicked instruments, for accomplishing the wise and holy designs of his providence and grace? But,

4thly. The chief reason which has induced many Christians to soften the story of Jephthah's unnatural murder and sacrifice, is his being mentioned in the catalogue of believers, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. xi. 32. From whence it is concluded, that he was not merely a good man, but a man of eminent piety, as all whose names are in that catalogue are supposed to be. And, taking this for granted, they argue, How can it be thought that a good man, nay, an eminently good man, should deliberately commit so horrid a crime, which was doubly contrary to the divine law, as to murder and sacrifice his own daughter?

To this it is replied,

1st. That there are great infirmities and faults of good men recorded in Scripture, which, perhaps, considering all circumstances, were as heinous as this action of Jephthah's. As David's debauching the wife of Uriah, and then perfidiously procuring the death of her husband; and Solomon's idolatry, of whom, though it is not expressly said that he offered any human sacrifices, yet we read that he went "after Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites," 1 Kings xi. 5; which is another name for Molech, as the same idol is called: he "built an high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, and Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon;" ver. 7. Now it being well known, that human sacrifices were commonly offered by the heathens to the idol Molech, it is not an improbable inference, from the passages just cited, that Solomon offered them. However that be, if Solomon, the son of David, who lived in times of great light, and had enjoyed

the advantage of a religious education far beyond what Jephthah had done; if he practised the idolatrous worship of the Moabites and Ammonites, is it any wonder Jephthah should be led by a blind superstition to sacrifice his daughter? It is certain Jephthah had had, comparatively, but mean advantages for the knowledge of religion, and the law of God. In his younger days he dwelt at Gilead, on the other side Jordan, very remote from Shiloh, where the tabernacle was, where the public ordinances of divine worship were celebrated, and which, therefore, in those times, was the fountain of knowledge and religion among the Jews. After his father's death, his brethren drove him out of the family, upon which he went and dwelt in the land of Tob, a country no where else mentioned in Scripture, but it was, undoubtedly, out of Canaan, and therefore a heathen country. And now, when he returned into the land of Israel, the true religion was even there at a very low ebb, according to the account we have of the state of it amongst the Israelites in those days: "The children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim and Ashtaroth, and the gods of Syria, and the gods of Zidon, and the gods of Moab, and the gods of the children of Ammon, and the gods of the Philistines, and forsook the Lord, and served him not;" Judges x. 6. And though we read, indeed, ver. 16, that they had put away the strange gods, before Jephthah's return, yet the knowledge of the law of God could not be revived on a sudden. Probably, therefore, as Jephthah had lived among the heathen, with whom human sacrifices were commonly practised, and had little opportunity of acquaintance with the law of Jehovah, he might, at that time, think the highest honour he could pay to the God of Israel was to offer him a human sacrifice. Now, all this considered, will not his unavoidable ignorance plead strongly in his excuse? And may we not suppose he was a man of a pious turn, and had a zeal for God, though not according to knowledge, when he made and performed this vow?

2dly. Shall I venture to suggest a query, whether Jephthah's name, being inserted in the catalogue of believers, or of those who are remarkable instances of the power of faith, is sufficient to prove that he was a good man? The design of this chapter is plainly to show the power of faith in several

different views of it, and as acted on several different objects. Therefore, though all the persons whose names are here mentioned, were, no doubt, remarkable instances of the power of faith, of one kind or another, yet it is not, perhaps, so certain, that they all had justifying and saving faith.

The first person mentioned in this catalogue is Abel, whose faith, as it rendered his sacrifice more acceptable to God than that of his brother Cain, must be supposed to respect the promised antitype of the ancient expiatory sacrifices, or the atonement of Christ. Soon after, Noah's faith is celebrated, for his believing God's threatenings of the universal deluge; and then the faith of Abraham and the patriarchs, by which they "looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God;" and which, therefore, made them easy and contented with their sojourning and unsettled condition in this world. All these are said to "die in faith;" Heb. xi. 13. After several other names, and instances of the power of faith as acted upon particular promises, the apostle mentions some of the Jewish heroic generals, whose faith in God's promise, of protecting and supporting their nation, inspired them with extraordinary courage in fighting for the Israelites against their enemies and oppressors, so that "by faith they subdued kingdoms." Yet, if a man might have the faith of miracles, so as to remove mountains, and not be a good man, as the apostle elsewhere supposes, 1 Cor. xiii. 2, might he not have this particular faith in God's promise of supporting the Israelitish nation, for which Rahab, and Gideon, and Barak, and Samson, and Jephthah, are here celebrated, and at the same time not be a good man?

It will be replied, perhaps,

1st. That after the catalogue of those names it is added, Heb. xi. 38, "of whom the world was not worthy."

I answer, That seems to be said, not of the victorious generals, who are mentioned along with Jephthah, but of another class of believers, who are mentioned after them, namely, the confessors and martyrs, who had been so unworthily treated by the world.

2dly. Is it not intimated in the two last verses of this eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that all those whose names were before recited are now made perfect?

"These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promises, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."

We answer, The verb τελειων, and the adjective τελειος, are applied by the Greek writers to maturity of age; and thus, in the New Testament, τελειων δε εστιν ἡ στερεα τροφη, Heb. v. 14, "Strong meat is for them that are of full age." Again, "In malice be ye children, but in understanding be ye men," τελειοι γινεσθε, 1 Cor. xiv. 20. And ανηρ τελειος, Eph. iv. 13, signifies a perfect or full-grown man.* Now, the apostle represents the church under the former dispensation, when those persons lived of whom he had been speaking before, as in a state of minority, but under the gospel dispensation as advanced to a state of maturity. The meaning, therefore, seems to be, that though God had vouchsafed some extraordinary measures of faith to particular persons, under the former dispensation, yet he did not then raise his church to that state of maturity to which he had now advanced it.

I shall close this dissertation with some arguments in confirmation of the more commonly received opinion, that Jephthah did sacrifice his daughter, and that he intended a human sacrifice when he made this vow.

Of this sentiment is Josephus, the Chaldee Paraphrast, and several famous rabbies. Some of them, indeed, founded their opinion on a mistaken sense of this passage in Leviticus, "None devoted, which shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed, but shall surely be put to death," מות יומת *moth jumath*, chap. xxvii. 29. From whence they concluded, that in some cases human sacrifices might be offered in conformity to the law of God. Whereas that text either means, according to Dr. Sykes, that every person who is devoted to the special service of God, as Samuel was by his mother, shall not be redeemed, but shall die in that devoted state; and he gives several instances, where מות יומת *moth jumath* is thus applied to a natural death, as when God said unto Adam, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," Gen. ii. 17; and when the Lord said of the murmuring Israelites, "They

* See Xenoph. Cyropæd. lib. i. p. 6, edit. Hutch. 1738, where τελειοις ανδρασιν may be translated, *viris adeptis plenum ætatem*, full-grown men.

shall surely die in the wilderness," Numb. xxvi. 65, though they were not sacrificed or executed, but died a natural death;* —or else the text in Leviticus, according to Mr. Selden, is to be restrained to such as were devoted to death by the appointment and law of God; as the inhabitants of Jericho, Josh. vi. 17; and such of the Israelites as in case of war did not obey military orders, and perform the charge laid upon them; in particular, the inhabitants of Jabesh Gilead, who complied not with the general summons to go and fight against Benjamin, Judges xxi. 5. 8—10. And perhaps it may extend to all who had been guilty of any crime that was made capital by the law of God, and so the design of it was no more than to restrain inferior magistrates from pardoning capital offenders, which was the prerogative of God only, as their king.†

Most of the ancient Christian writers are of opinion, that Jephthah actually sacrificed his daughter, and so is Dr. Lightfoot.‡

Now the chief reasons which are alleged in favour of this opinion, besides that it agrees to the more natural meaning of the Hebrew text, are,

1st. That there is no rule nor precedent in Scripture, to justify the practice of devoting persons to perpetual virginity; but, on the contrary, this is spoken of as one of the antichristian corruptions of the "latter times, when men should depart from the faith, and give heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils;" 1 Tim. iv. 1. Nor was there any office belonging to the temple service to be performed by women, except, perhaps, that some of the daughters of the Levites assisted by their voices in the temple choir, as some think is intimated in this passage of the first book of Chronicles, "And God gave to Heman fourteen sons and three daughters. All these were under the hands of their father, for song in the house of the Lord, with cymbals, psalteries, and harps, for the service of the house of God, according to the king's order, to Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman;" 1 Chron. xxv. 5, 6. How-

* See Sykes' Principles and Connexion of Natural and Revealed Religion, chap. xiii.

† Selden de Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. iv. cap. vi.—x.

‡ Serm. on Judges xi. 39, vol. ii. p. 1215.

ever, Jephthah was not a Levite, and therefore his daughter could bear no part even in that service, nor hath nunnery any countenance, either in the Jewish or Christian law; and to suppose, therefore, that Jephthah devoted his daughter to perpetual virginity, is to suppose him acting as contrary to the law of God, as if he had sacrificed her.

2dly. What could he expect to come out of the door of his house to meet him, but a human person? Can we think that Jephthah had his dog in his thoughts when he made this vow,—a creature that was particularly excepted from being in any sense sanctified and devoted to God, as any clean beast might be? Lev. xxvii. 9. 11, compared with Deut. xxiii. 18.

3dly. If he had intended no more than the sacrifice of a bullock, or a ram, what need was there of such a solemn vow? If he had meant a brutal sacrifice, he would surely have vowed to sacrifice hecatombs, rather than a single animal, on so great an occasion; or, like Jacob, he would have vowed to give the "tenth of all his substance unto the Lord;" Gen. xxviii. 22.

4thly. We read, that it was a "custom in Israel, that the daughters of Israel went yearly to lament the daughter of Jephthah;" Judges xi. 39, 40. Now the Hebrew word חק *chok*, which we render custom, signifies a statute or ordinance of lasting obligation. Thus it is peculiarly applied to the law which God gave by Moses in the following passage: "Behold I have taught you statutes (חקים *chukkim*) and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. Keep, therefore, and do them, for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations which shall hear all these statutes," כל-החקים *col-hachukkim*, Deut. iv. 6, and so in many other places. This custom, therefore, of the daughters of Israel, seems to be intended for an annual rite *in perpetuum*, and not that they went yearly to talk with her as long as she lived.

It is highly probable, that Homer grounded his fable of Agamemnon's sacrificing his daughter Iphigenia on some tradition of Jephthah's sacrifice. And indeed the name Iphigenia seems to be a corruption of Jephthigenia, the daughter of Jephthah. Ovid, who has dressed up the story in his way, makes Diana put a stag in her room, and seems, therefore, to have blended the tradition of Abraham's sacrifice with that of

Jephthah.* But to return to the consideration of the Hebrew government.

We have distinguished the time in which God exercised a special authority over the people of Israel into four periods, and are now upon the second of them, namely, from their entrance into Canaan to the captivity. We have gone through the government of the judges. We proceed now to the reign of the kings.

This continued, saith Godwin, from Saul to the captivity of Babylon, about 530 years. But as, in the course of this work, we shall have a chapter by itself concerning the Jewish kings, I shall only for the present observe, that they were of two sorts, those that reigned over the whole Hebrew nation, who were only three, Saul, David, and Solomon, and those that reigned over some of the tribes only.

And these were,

1st. The kings of the house of David, who were twenty in number, if you reckon Athaliah the queen, who usurped the throne for six years, after the death of her son Ahaziah; 2 Kings xi. These kings reigned over the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, until Nebuchadnezzar carried Zedekiah, the last of them, captive unto Babylon. They took their title from the larger tribe, and were called kings of Judah.

2dly. The kings of Israel, who reigned over the other ten tribes, from the time of their rebellion against Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, to the Assyrian captivity. These kings were of several different families, and were in all nineteen, from Jeroboam, the first, to Hosea, the last.

We now proceed to the third period, which takes in the time of the captivity, and concludes with the end of it.

As the Hebrew nation was divided into two distinct kingdoms, so each kingdom suffered a distinct captivity; the one is called the Assyrian, the other the Babylonish.

The Assyrian captivity was that of the ten tribes, which was begun in the reign of Pekah, king of Israel, when Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, conquered a part of his country, and carried away the people captive to Assyria; 2 Kings xv. 29. It was afterward completed by Salmanassar, who took Sa-

† Vid. Capelli Diatrab. de voto Jephth. per totum; apud criticos sacros in Jud. xi., and Mr. Hallet's note on Heb. ix. 32.

maria, the capital of the kingdom of Israel, after three years' siege, and went up through the land, and carried away the residue of the people captive into Assyria; 2 Kings xvii. 5, 6.

The people of the kingdom of Israel had greatly corrupted the worship of God, and had been very much given to idolatry, ever since their separation from the kingdom of Judah. It is said, that "they walked in the statutes of the heathen, and served idols;" ver. 8. 12. And it is no wonder, therefore, that, when they were removed into Assyria, multitudes of them fell in with the idolatrous worship and customs of that country, becoming mixed with the Assyrians, and in time losing the very name of Jews and Israelites, insomuch that the greater part of the ten tribes, as a peculiar people and visible church of God, were quite lost in that captivity.

The Babylonish captivity was that of the kingdom of Judah, or of the two tribes who adhered to the house of David. It was begun by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, in the reign of Jehoiakim, whom Nebuchadnezzar "bound in fetters, to carry him to Babylon. And he also carried away some of the vessels belonging to the house of the Lord, to furnish his own temple in Babylon;" 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, 7. From hence begun the period of the seventy years' captivity. The people, buoyed up by their false prophets, were induced to believe, that these sacred vessels should be shortly brought again from Babylon; but Jeremiah assured them of the contrary, and that all the remaining vessels should be carried after them; Jer. xxvii. 16, 17. 21, 22. Accordingly, about nine years afterward, in the reign of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadnezzar made a second descent against Judah, and "besieged Jerusalem, and took it, and carried away the king, and all the nobles, and the great men, and officers, and ten thousand captives, to Babylon, with all the treasure of the house of the Lord, and the treasure of the king's house; and cut in pieces all the vessels of gold which Solomon had made for the temple;" 2 Kings xxiv. 10—16. But the word ויקצץ *vaikatzetz* is not well rendered "cut in pieces," since it appears, by a passage in Daniel, that these vessels were preserved entire, for "Belshazzar, and his princes, his wives, and his concubines, drank wine in them;" Dan. v. 2. The verb קצץ *katzatz* signifies "to cut off;" as in the following passage of the second book of Samuel,

"David commanded his young men, and they slew them, that is, Rechab and Baanah, the murderers of Ishbosheth, and cut off, ויקצצו *vaikatzetzu*, their hands and their feet," &c., 2 Sam. iv. 12;* where it is used in the same form as it is in the passage before us, in which, therefore, it can mean no more than the vessels being cut off from their stands or bases, and taken away from the temple.

Again, eleven years after this, in the reign of Zedekiah, Nebuzar-adan, the Babylonian general, came and sacked and burnt Jerusalem, and the temple, and carried away the remainder of the sacred vessels, together with all the Jews who remained in the country (except some poor people, whom he left to till the land), captives into Babylon; 2 Kings xxv. 8. &c.

Four years after this, which was the twenty-third of the seventy, or from the beginning of the Babylonish captivity, Nebuzar-adan again invaded the land of Israel, and seized upon all the Jews he could meet with, and sent them captive to Babylon; Jer. lii. 30. This was done probably in revenge for the murder of Gedaliah, whom Nebuchadnezzar had made governor of the land, but whom Ishmael killed; Jer. xli. 2. Upon the murder of Gedaliah, Johanan, the son of Kareah, and many of the people that were left, fled into Egypt for fear of the king of Babylon: ver. 16—18; chap. xliii. 4—7. So that all the Jews that Nebuzar-adan now found, and made captive, amounted to no more than seven hundred and fifty persons. Thus was the captivity of Judah completed, and the land was made desolate, none of its former inhabitants being now left in it.

But though the captivity of Israel and of Judah had different beginnings, the former commencing a hundred years before the latter; yet they ended together, when Cyrus, the king of Persia, having conquered both the Chaldeans and Assyrians, and obtained universal monarchy, issued out a decree for restoring the Jews to their own land, and for rebuilding Jerusalem and the temple; Ezra i. 1—3. This is that famous Cyrus, who, one hundred and forty years before the temple was destroyed, and two hundred years before he was

* So also, 2 Kings xvi. 17, Ahaz "cut off" the borders of the bases, &c.; and, chap. xviii. 16, Hezekiah "cut off" the gold from the doors, &c. Hallet's Notes and Discourses, vol. i. p. 1.

born, was mentioned by name, in the prophecy of Isaiah, as designed by God for restoring his people: Isa. xliv. 28; xlv. 1—4. It is not improbable, that prophecy might have been shown to Cyrus by some captive Jews, perhaps by Daniel, which might be a means of moving him to accomplish it. This appears to have been the opinion of the Jews in the time of Josephus, which they had probably received by tradition. For he makes Cyrus say, in his decree, "Because the supreme God hath apparently made me king of the world, I believe him to be he, whom the people of Israel adore; for he predicted my name by his prophets, and that I should build his temple at Jerusalem in the land of Judea."*

Upon this decree, the tribes of Judah and Benjamin assembled out of the several provinces of the kingdom of Babylon, and put themselves under the conduct of Zerubbabel, the grandson of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, who was made their governor, and of Joshua the high-priest, to the number of forty-nine thousand six hundred and ninety-seven persons, and returned to their own land; Ezra ii. And though the ten tribes, in their national capacity, were never restored, but the most part continue in their dispersion to this day, insomuch that the Assyrian captivity put a final period to the kingdom of Israel; yet, as the decree of Cyrus extended to all the Jews, several persons belonging to the ten tribes now joined themselves to Judah and Benjamin, and returned with them to their own land. We read, therefore, that among the sacrifices offered at the feast of the dedication of the temple, on its being rebuilt, there were "twelve he-goats, according to the number of the tribes of Israel;" Ezra vi. 17. Again, we read of "twelve bullocks" being sacrificed "for all Israel;" Ezra viii. 35. From whence it is highly probable, that some of all the ten tribes were now returned; though still it appears, that great numbers of the Jews, probably most part of the ten tribes, who still adhered to the old religion, remained among the heathen in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus; whom Dr. Prideaux takes to be the Ahasuerus mentioned in the book of Esther, and for which opinion he offers substantial reasons. This, therefore, must have been near eighty years

* Antiq. lib. xi. cap. i. sect. i. edit. Haverc.

after their first return, in the reign of Cyrus. It was at this time that Ezra, a descendant from Seraiah the high-priest, and on account of his great learning called the scribe, obtained an ample commission from Artaxerxes for his return to Jerusalem, with all of his own nation who were willing to accompany him; Ezra vii. Upon this, many more of the Jews returned to their own land. Yet, after all, few of the ten tribes, in comparison with those of Judah and Benjamin, ever returned from their dispersion. It appears, that at the time of Haman's conspiracy, which must have been four or five years after the second return under Ezra, there were still a multitude of Jews dispersed through the various provinces of the Persian empire, besides those who had mingled with idolaters, and embraced their religion. Dr. Prideaux thinks it was by the favour of Esther that Ezra obtained his commission, and was made governor of the Jews in their own land; which government he exercised for thirteen years. After him succeeded Nehemiah, who had a new commission granted him by Artaxerxes, in the twentieth year of his reign, with full authority to repair the wall of Jerusalem, and fortify it, in the same manner as before it was dismantled by the Babylonians.

It may reasonably be conjectured, that queen Esther's interest with the king did not a little contribute to obtain this farther favour for the Jews; and so much, indeed, seems to be hinted in the history of this transaction, where it is particularly remarked, that when Artaxerxes gave this new commission to Nehemiah, "the queen was sitting by him;" Neh. ii. 6.

Nehemiah's commission superseded that of Ezra, who therefore now resigned his government, and employed himself in collecting and publishing a new and correct edition of the Scriptures, and in restoring the worship of God to its original purity.*

We proceed to the fourth period of the Jewish history, which contains about six hundred years, from the end of their captivity to the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Jewish polity.

The Jews, who, after the return from the captivity, were

* See Prideaux's Connect. part i. book v.

settled again in their own land, were no longer divided into two kingdoms, as they were before; but were all one people, and under one government; which yet varied in its form through several succeeding ages.

1st. Upon their return from the captivity, Judea became a province of the Persian empire, and was tributary to the Persian monarch; as appears from the letter which the enemies of the Jews wrote to Artaxerxes, in order to prevent the rebuilding of Jerusalem; in which are these words, "Be it known now unto the king, that if this city be builded, and the walls set up again, then will they not pay toll, tribute, and custom, and so thou shalt endamage the revenue of the kings;" Ezra iv. 13. Notwithstanding which, though tributary, they enjoyed their own religion, and were governed by their own laws; and their governors, though they acted by virtue of a commission from the court of Persia, were, nevertheless, of their own nation; as Zerubbabel, Ezra, Nehemiah.

2dly. This state of things, and this form of government, continued for upwards of two hundred years, until the time of Alexander the Great; who, having destroyed the Persian empire, and established the Grecian universal monarchy, the Jews became subject to him and his successors. Yet they were not properly conquered by him, as all the neighbouring nations were; God having preserved them by a special and very extraordinary providence, which is thus related by Josephus.*

When Alexander was engaged in the siege of Tyre, he sent to Jaddua, the Jewish high-priest, for auxiliary troops, and necessaries for his army. Jaddua excused himself, alleging his oath to Darius. Alexander, being greatly incensed, resolved to take a severe revenge. As soon, therefore, as he had made himself master of Tyre, and of Gaza, he marched against Jerusalem. Jaddua, in his pontifical robes, accompanied by the other priests in their proper habits, went out, by divine direction, in solemn procession to meet Alexander. As soon as the king saw him, he hastened toward him, and bowed down to him with a religious veneration of that sacred name which was inscribed on the golden fillet round his tiara.

* Antiq. lib. xi. cap. viii. sect. iii.—v. edit. Haverc.

While all stood amazed at this extraordinary behaviour, Parmenio alone ventured to inquire of him, why he, who was adored by all, should himself pay such devotion to the Jewish high-priest. He replied, he did not pay it to the high-priest, but to the God whose priest he was; for that when he was at Dio in Macedonia, and was deliberating how he should carry on the war against the Persians, this very person, in the very habit he now wore, appeared to him in a dream, and encouraged him to pass over into Asia; assuring him, that God would give him the Persian empire. Having said this, Alexander gave his hand to Jaddua, and entered Jerusalem with him in a very friendly manner, and under his direction offered sacrifices to God in the temple. Here Jaddua showed him the prophecy of Daniel, which predicted the overthrow of the Persian empire by a Grecian king. At which he was so pleased, that he ordered the Jews to request whatever was agreeable to them. Upon this Jaddua petitioned, that they might enjoy their own laws and religion, and be excused from paying tribute every seventh year, because in that year they neither sowed nor reaped. All which he freely granted.

After the death of Alexander, the Jews became subject and tributary to the kings of Egypt, or Syria; as by various turns of providence, one or the other extended their dominion and power into those parts. The former were called Lagii, or Lagides, from Lagus, the father of Ptolemy the First; the latter, Seleucii, or Seleucides, from Seleucus Nicanor, king of Syria.

The Jews, at length, were miserably persecuted and distressed by Antiochus Epiphanes, the eighth of the Seleucian kings, about one hundred and seventy years before Christ. He is generally supposed to be that "vile person," of whom Daniel prophesied under that appellation, chap. xi. 21, &c.; and he actually proved altogether as profane and cruel as the prophet represents him; for he laid siege to Jerusalem, and took it by storm, and in two days' time massacred forty thousand of its inhabitants, and sold as many more to the neighbouring nations for slaves. He impiously forced himself into the temple, and into the holy of holies; he sacrificed a great sow upon the altar of burnt-offering, and caused broth to be made of some part of the flesh, and to be sprinkled all over

the temple. He afterward plundered the sacred edifice of all its golden and silver vessels and utensils, to the value of eighteen hundred talents of gold; and having made the like plunder in the city, he left it, after he had, to the further vexation of the Jews, appointed Philip, a Phrygian, to be their governor; who was a man of a cruel and barbarous temper. Upon this,

3dly. Their state and form of government was changed by the Maccabees.

When Antiochus had issued out a decree, that all nations under his dominion should conform to his religion, and worship the same gods, and in the same manner, that he did, which decree was levelled chiefly against the Jews, he sent commissioners to execute it in Judea. One of them, named Apelles, came to Modin, where dwelt Mattathias, a very honourable priest, and zealous for the law of his God; he was the great-grandson of Asmonæus; from whence it is probable the family had the name of Asmoneans; though others derive that title from the Hebrew word חשמנים *chashmannim*, which signifies *magnates* or *proceres*. This Mattathias, with his five sons, fell upon the king's commissioner, as he was endeavouring to persuade the people to sacrifice to idols, and slew him and all his attendants. After which he retired into the mountains; whither many of the Jews following him, they formed an army, and stood upon their defence. Afterward, leaving their fastnesses, they went about the country, destroying the heathen altars and idolaters, and restoring the worship of God according to the law, wherever they came. Mattathias, who was aged, died the next year, and was succeeded in the command of the army by his son Judas; who took for the motto of his standard,

מי כמכה באלם יהוה
mi camo-ka baelim Jehovah.---Exod. xv. 11.

"Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods?" This motto is said to have been written, not at length, but only by the first letter of each word מכבי; as *P. S. Q. R.*, for *populus senatusque Romanus*, was written on the Roman standard. These four initial letters are generally supposed to have formed the artificial word Maccabi; from whence this Judas has been

commonly called Judas Maccabæus; and those that sided with him, and fought under his standard, were termed Maccabees. This is the opinion of Buxtorf, Prideaux, and almost all the learned. But Dr. Kennicot doubts of this derivation, since in some ancient manuscripts the name is written with a ק instead of a כ.* But whatever was the original of the word Maccabæus, it afterward became a general name for all such as suffered in the cause of the true religion, under the Egyptian or Syrian kings. Accordingly, it is applied by the ancient Christian writers to some who died many years before Judas set up his standard.†

The Jews enjoyed their liberty under a succession of the Asmonean princes, though not without frequent wars and confusions, for near a hundred years; till Aristobulus, endeavouring to wrest the crown from his elder brother Hyrcanus, raised a civil war; which gave the Romans an opportunity to conquer Judea, and to reduce it into the form, first of a tributary kingdom, and afterward of a Roman province. This brings us to the last state of the Jews before their utter destruction as a nation.

4thly. They were subject to the Romans, and governed by kings appointed by the Roman emperors; as by Herod, and afterward by his son Archelaus, and then by a succession of Roman prefects, till the period of their state and polity, when the "sceptre entirely departed from Judah, and the lawgiver from between his feet," according to Jacob's cele-

* See his second Dissert. on the state of the printed Hebrew Text, p. 535.

† If the common derivation of the name Maccabees, be the true one, it was probably the original of artificial names, made of initial letters; which have since been much used both by Jews and Christians. Thus, among the Jews, Rambam signifies Rabbi Moses Ben Maimon; and Ralbag stands for Rabbi Levi Ben Gerson. We have likewise modern instances of the same sort of devices in our own country. About the year 1640 there were several treatises published against Diocesan Episcopacy under the name Smectymnuus, which was made of the initial letters of the names of five divines, who were the authors of those pieces---Stephen Marshal, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstow. The word Cabal is of the same kind, being made of the initial letters of the names of five lords in Charles the Second's reign, who caballed together, as we may now express it, to make the king absolute; Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Anthony Ashley Cooper, and Lauderdale.

brated prophecy, which Godwin speaks of at the end of his first chapter. But as his account of it, and of the controversies concerning its meaning and accomplishment, is very imperfect, I shall here give a more full and complete one.

Concerning Jacob's Prophecy.

"The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be;" Gen. xlix. 10.

And here,

1st. I will consider the literal meaning of the words: And,

2dly. Their prophetic import.

1st. As to the literal meaning of those words, concerning which any doubt has been made, they are these four, שבט *shebhet*, the sceptre; מחקק *mechokek*, the lawgiver; רגליו *raglaiv*, his feet; and שילה *Shiloh*.

The first word is שבט *shebhet*, which we translate the sceptre; for which rendering we have the united authority of the three Targums, namely, Onkelos, Jonathan, and the Jerusalem; besides a great many of the modern rabbies. But others understand by it a tribe, as the same word sometimes signifies; particularly in the sixteenth and twenty-eighth verses of this very chapter in which the prophecy we are now considering is recorded, and in some other places. And so they make the meaning of the first clause to be, "Judah shall not cease from being a tribe." Others again (chiefly of the modern Jews), understand by שבט *shebhet*, the rod of correction or affliction, as the word sometimes imports: Job ix. 34; 2 Sam. vii. 14; Lam. iii. 1. Accordingly, they make this clause to signify, Judah shall not cease from being an afflicted people. But the peace and prosperity which Judah and all Israel have sometimes enjoyed, particularly during the reigns of David and Solomon, are a sufficient objection against adopting that sense in this place. The truth is, שבט *shebhet*, from שבט *shabhat*, *produxit*, to produce, primarily signifies a rod or wand, shooting from the root of a tree; and, in a metaphorical sense, it denotes correction, of which a rod is often the instrument; a tribe, which springs out of a common stock; a sceptre, and several other things. The meaning of it, therefore, in any particular place, must be determined by the context, and by the subject there spoken of. Now, as the context immediately preceding

this famous prophecy foretells the dominion of Judah, not only over his enemies, but over his brethren, ver. 8, 9, nothing can be so naturally understood by שבט *shebhet*, in this clause, as a sceptre; and so it predicts the continuance and duration of that power and authority which was just before promised. In this sense the same phrase is used, nor is it capable of any other, when it is said, "The sceptre of Egypt shall depart away;" Zech. x. 11.

The next word to be explained is מחקק *mechokek*, from חקק *chakak, scripsit, statuit, mandavit*, to ordain, command; which is therefore very properly rendered a lawgiver. However, it seems to be a word of a lower signification than שבט *shebhet*, which denotes royal authority; as, "he that holdeth the sceptre," means the king; Amos i. 5. Accordingly, the מחקקים *mechokekim*, mentioned in the book of Judges, are the chief men, or magistrates, of the tribes of Israel, Judges v. 9. 14; who, though they were governors, as we render the word, yet were not vested with royal and supreme authority.

The next word is רגליו *raglaiv*, his feet; of the literal meaning of which there is no doubt, unless we admit the correction of Ludolphus, who for רגליו *raglaiv* would read דגליו *diglaiv*, his banner, agreeably to the Samaritan copy. But there is no sufficient reason to admit this correction, contrary to the Targums, and most of the ancient versions. The phrase, therefore, מבין רגליו *mibbein raglaiv*, either signifies, as Waginseil renders it, even "to the last end of his state;" just as, "the people at the feet," an expression used in some places (Exod. xi. 8; 2 Kings iii. 9), denotes those that follow, or bring up the rear; or the word מבין *mibbein* seems to determine רגליו *raglaiv* to the sense that is more commonly received, namely, from thy seed or posterity, referring to the situation of the parts of generation.

4thly. But the greatest controversy of all is about the meaning of the word שילה *Shiloh*, which our translators have not ventured to render by an English word, but have retained the original. As it is an απαξ λεγομενον, and nothing in the context will certainly determine from what root it is derived, interpreters are much divided about its signification. Le Clerc is for deducing it from the Chaldee word שלה *shelah, cessavit*, to cease, and so makes it to signify the end. Accordingly he represents the sense of this prophecy to be, "that from the time the sceptre came

into the tribe of Judah, it will continue in it, till that tribe be at an end." But this opinion has been confuted by Monsieur Saurin.* The translators of the Arabic and Syriac versions seem to have read שלו *shelo, illius,* his, or to him, and so render it, "whose it is," that is, the kingdom. And not much different is the Septuagint version, which renders שילה *Shiloh,* τα αποκειμενα αυτῳ, *donec veniant quæ repósita sunt ei,* or, according to other copies, ὡ απωκειται, he for whom it is reserved. Others derive it from שיל *shil,* which they will have to signify a son, because שליה *shileiah* signifies something that belongs to the birth. But I take the most probable opinion to be, either that *Shiloh* comes from שלח *shilach, misit,* to send, writing ה for ח, and so it signifies him that is sent, or whom God would send; under which character our Saviour is often spoken of in the New Testament (and this is the opinion of Jerome and Grotius); or else it comes from שלה *shalah, tranquillus est, quievit,* and so it signifies peaceable, or a peace-maker; answerable to that name of the Messiah, שר שלום *sar shalom,* the prince of peace; Isa. ix. 6. But let the original of the word שילה *Shiloh* be what it will, it is almost universally acknowledged to mean the Messiah; in particular, by all the Targums, as well as by many other ancient and modern Jews, as well as Christians. Having thus considered the literal meaning of the words of this prophecy, we are,

2dly. To inquire into its prophetical import, and the time of its accomplishment.

According to the learned Joseph Mede, in his discourse on this prophecy, the sceptre, and the lawgiver, are pretty much synonymous terms, importing any power or majesty of government, under what form or name soever; and the meaning of the sceptre not departing from Judah is, not that it should not cease from having a king, or being a kingdom; but that it should not cease from being a state or body politic, or from having a power of government and jurisdiction within itself, till the Messiah came. Accordingly, it is observable, that Judah, with the little appendage of Benjamin, was the only tribe in which the sceptre did, in this sense, continue to the end of the Jewish polity. For it entirely departed from the other ten tribes at the Assyrian captivity.

* See his Disc. Histor. disc. xli.

As for the last clause of the prophecy, "to him shall the gathering of the people be," Mr. Mede understands it of another event, which should also be accomplished before the sceptre departed from Judah, namely, the conversion of the Gentiles to the Christian faith. When, therefore, our Saviour foretells the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish state, he adds, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness to all nations, and then shall the end come;" Matt. xxiv. 14. But Dr. Patrick inclines to Waginseil's sense; which is, that there should be either king or governor among the Jews till the coming of Christ; for the *Vau* before מחקק *mechokek* may as well be understood disjunctively as copulatively: in which case, "the sceptre" may refer to the royal government in the house of David; and the "lawgiver" (which, we observed before, is a word of a lower signification), to the form of government under Zerubbabel, the Maccabees, &c., till Judea was made a Roman province. For though some of these governors were not of the tribe of Judah; the Maccabees, for instance, who were priests of the tribe of Levi; nevertheless the tribe of Judah was the centre of the state, or the seat of government. And he farther observes, that these two forms of government, signified by the sceptre and the lawgiver, nearly divided the whole time, from the beginning to the end of Judah's authority, into two equal parts, there being a little more than five centuries under each. However, presently after our Saviour's birth, the Jews lost even their מחקקים *mechokekim*, or governors, as they had before lost the sceptre; and the administration of public affairs was no longer in their own hands.*

* Mede's Diatribæ, disc. viii.; Kidder's Demonst. of the Messiah, part iii. chap. vii.; Saurin's Discours. Histor. disc. xli.; Patrick in loc.; Prideaux's Connect. sub. A. C. 8. vol. iv. p. 932, edit. x.; Bishop Sherlock's third dissert. in his Disc. on Prophecy; Bishop of Bristol (Newton) on the Prophecies, vol. i. p. 94, &c. An account of the various interpretations, both of the Jews and Christians, may be found, not only in these authors, but in Le Clerc in loc., and especially in Martin. Helvic. de vaticin. Jacobi, apud Critic. Sacr. tom. viii.; Huet. Demonst. Evang. prop. ix. cap. iv.; Christoph. Cartwright. electa Targumico Rabbin. in Gen.; and Jacobi Altingii Schilo, seu de Patriarchæ Jacobi vaticinio.

On the general subject of the preceding chapter, see Spencer de Theocratiâ Judaicâ; apud Leges Hebræor.; Witsius de Theocrat. Israeliticâ; and especially Mr. Lowman's Civil Government of the Hebrews.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE PUBLICANS.

BEFORE we treat of the publicans, or tax-gatherers, it will be proper to premise something concerning the Jewish taxes.

Of the Taxes.

It was observed, in a former lecture, that as the law of Moses was the only *codex juris*, or body of law, enacted by God, the king of Israel, for the government both of church and state; and as the priests were appointed to dispense it, they are properly to be considered as ministers of state, as well as of religion; and therefore the tithes, and the portion of sacrifices, which the law assigned for their maintenance, were in the nature of taxes, payable for the support of the government. Besides these, we read of no other stated taxes appointed by the law; except a poll-tax of half a shekel, which, when they were numbered in the wilderness, was levied upon every man from twenty years old and upwards; and it is said to be designed for "a ransom, or atonement, for his soul," and to be "appointed for the service of the tabernacle of the congregation;" Exod. xxx. 12—16. It is not provided that this tax should be paid annually; but being intended for the ransom of their souls, or as an act of homage and acknowledgment to God of their being his redeemed people, there was equal reason, in the opinion of the Jewish doctors, for its constant subsistence, as for its original appointment; and being devoted to the service of the tabernacle of the congregation, by which they understand their daily sacrifice and offerings, salt for the sacrifices, wood for the altar of burnt-offering, incense, shew-bread, &c., which were constant national charges; from hence they infer, that the tax to support

them must be national, and annual, or stated. But Grotius is of opinion, that this poll-tax, at least in the former ages of the Hebrew commonwealth, was not annual; but only levied on peculiar exigencies; as when the free-will offerings, dedicated by the princes and people to maintain the house of the Lord, were not sufficient (for we read of large donations for that purpose in David's time, which seem to render the poll-tax needless, 1 Chron. xxvi. 26, 27); or, when some extraordinary expense, about the sanctuary and its service, occurred; as for repairing the temple in the reign of king Joash; who "gathered the priests and the Levites, and commanded them to collect from all Israel money to repair the house of the Lord from year to year;" and, on account of their dilatoriness, the order being repeated, "proclamation was made through Judah and Jerusalem to bring in the collection that Moses, the servant of God, laid upon Israel in the wilderness;" 2 Chron. xxiv. 5, 6. 9. Now one can hardly suppose this tax would have been levied by proclamation, unless it had been occasional, and not stated and annual. In Nehemiah's time it was also levied by a new ordinance; for which there would have been no occasion, if the law of Moses had made it perpetual.* On account of the people's poverty, it was, at this time, lowered from one-half to one-third of a shekel; Nehem. x. 32, 33. This third of a shekel Aben-ezra will have to be an additional voluntary contribution, over and above the annual tax of the half shekel. But, considering the low circumstances the Jews were now in, and how they had been impoverished by the late captivity, that is not probable.†

If we suppose this poll-tax was not, by divine appointment, stated and annual, but only levied on public exigencies, we may, perhaps, be able to account for David's numbering the people being represented as so heinous a sin, 2 Sam. xxiv.; 1 Chron. xxi.; for which different interpreters have given very different reasons.

The common opinion is, that his sin consisted in his pride and vanity, which made him desirous of knowing how populous and powerful his country was. Ralbag, who is followed by Abarbanel, conceives it lay in making flesh his arm, and con-

* See Lowman's Civil Govern. of the Hebr. p. 96, et seq.

† See Aben-ezra in loc., and Grotius on Matt. xvii. 24.

fiding in the multitude of his subjects. Some make it consist in infidelity, and mistrust of God's promise to Abraham, that he would "increase his seed like the stars of heaven, which no man should be able to number;" Gen. xv. 5.

However, if Grotius be right about the poll-tax, it may incline one to adopt Dr. Lightfoot's opinion, that "God gave up David to a covetous thought to number the people, that he might lay a tax upon every poll."* And if so, we cannot wonder his sin is represented as so heinous: the guilt was very complicated, being, besides avarice, a contradiction to the law of God, in levying the tax when there was no occasion for it, and an act of tyranny and oppression on the people. But to return.

However it was in former times, this tax certainly became annual and stated in the later ages of the Jewish commonwealth; having, perhaps, been made so by the Asmonean princes; who being high-priests, as well as possessed of the sovereign civil authority, would very likely be for increasing the ecclesiastical revenues, by converting that occasional tax into a stated one. We have the testimony of Josephus, that this tax was paid annually; for he saith, Vespasian commanded every Jew to pay the annual tribute of two drachmæ to the capitol, which had been formerly paid to the temple at Jerusalem.† Now bishop Cumberland informs us, that the attic drachm answered to the fourth part of the Jewish shekel, which weighed half an ounce avoirdupois;‡ two drachms, therefore, answered to the half shekel, being in value of our money a little more than one shilling and two-pence. Mr. Selden§ thinks, that this was the tax Cicero refers to, when, in his oration *pro Flacco*, he speaks of "gold, sent every year in the name of the Jews out of Italy, and all the provinces, to Jerusalem."‖ This I take to be the tribute which was demanded of Christ, Matt. xvii. 24; not only because it is called διδραχμα, which signifieth two drachms, and so answereth

* Harmony of the Old Test. sub Anno Mund. 2988, Davidis, 39.

† De Bell. Jud. lib. vii. cap. vi. sect. vi. edit. Haverc.; see also Dion Cassius, lib. lxvi. cap. vii. p. 1082, edit. Reimari, 1752.

‡ See his Essay on Jewish Weights and Measures, chap. iv.

§ De Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. vi. cap. xviii. apud Opera, vol. i. tom. i. p. 691, edit. Londini, 1726.

‖ Ciceronis Oper. vol. v. sect. xxvii. p. 345, edit. Olivet. Genev. 1758.

to the Jewish half shekel; but because the reason which he allegeth, why he might have excused himself from paying it, ver 25, 26, shows it was a tribute paid, not to the Roman emperor, as Salmasius thinks,* but to God, for the service of his temple: so that Christ, being the Son of God, might have pleaded an exemption.

It may possibly be objected, that if this tribute was a stated annual tax, payable by every Jew, how came the collectors to inquire of Peter, "Doth not your Master pay tribute?" To this it is replied,

1st. They might be in doubt, whether he would choose to pay it at Capernaum, where at that time he was, which, very likely, they could not have obliged him to do; or at his own town of Nazareth, or at Jerusalem. Or,

2dly. The meaning of the question may be, whether he would pay it then, on the spot. For the doctors tells us, that, on the first day of the month Adar, notice was given, throughout all the country, for men to make this payment; and officers were appointed to sit in every city of Judea to receive it; yet nobody was obliged to pay it immediately; but if they did not pay it in a certain prefixed time afterward, they were then compelled.

These taxes, namely, the tithes, the sacrificial offerings, and the poll-tax of the half shekel (whether annual or occasional), are all the taxes expressly levied by the Mosaic law. We read, indeed, of an extraordinary contribution for the building of the tabernacle, which God ordered Moses to recommend to the people, Exod. xxv. 2; and which they made so liberally, that their lawgiver thought proper to restrain them by proclamation; Exod. xxxvi. 3—7. However, this was not in the nature of a tax, but a free gift, every one giving as he pleased.

As for the expenses of war, in which the Israelites were often engaged, it is to be considered, that they held their estates by military tenure; for it appeareth from the exemptions allowed some persons on particular occasions, from attending military service, Deut. xx. 5, &c., that all others were bound to attend.† So that the Israelitish troops were a militia,

* Salmasii ad Johannem Miltonum responsio, p. 272.

† See Lowman's Civil Government of the Hebrews, chap. iv. p. 52.

maintained at their own expense; which was the reason of Jesse's sending provisions to his sons in Saul's army; 1 Sam. xvii. 17, 18. There was ordinarily, therefore, no need of taxes to defray the charges of war.

When the Israelites came to be governed by kings, who, like other monarchs, affected pomp and magnificence, no doubt, some taxes were necessary to defray that extraordinary expense, and to support the dignity of the crown: and though these taxes were not properly of God's appointment, any more than the regal government itself, yet the Jews look upon this law in the book of Deuteronomy, "Neither shall the king greatly multiply to himself silver and gold," Deut. xvii. 17, as implying a permission to levy necessary taxes on the people; only God, foreseeing they would in time change the form of government which he had appointed into a monarchy, like that of other nations, restrains their kings by this prohibition from levying expensive taxes on the subject.

It should seem, Solomon did not sufficiently regard this restraint; for he multiplied to himself, not only "horses and wives," contrary to the law, ver. 16, 17, but also "silver and gold;" so that the people groaned under the burden of taxes; which proved the immediate occasion of the revolt of the ten tribes from his son and successor Rehoboam; 1 Kings xii. 4. How these taxes were levied does not appear in the scripture history.

After the captivity, the Jews were tributary to the Persians, as is plain from the letter which their enemies wrote to Artaxerxes, to prevent the rebuilding of Jerusalem; in which they inform him, that if the city be built and fortified, then the Jews "will not pay toll, tribute, and custom;" Ezra iv. 13. We have no account how the toll, tribute, and custom, here mentioned, were levied. By the first of these words, Grotius understands a poll-tax; by the second, a duty upon commodities and merchandise; and by the third, a tax upon their land: but Witsius, a land-tax, or rather a tax on property in general, by the first; a poll-tax, by the second; and a toll collected on the road from merchants, who travelled with their goods from place to place, by the third.* However that be, it

* Miscell. tom. ii. exercitat. xi. sect. xxi. p. 289.

is probable the whole tribute to the Persian monarch was paid by the chief governor of Judea, out of the taxes which he levied on the subject.

When Pompey conquered Judea, and put an end to the Asmonean race of kings (which Godwin says was about sixty years before Christ), the Jews became tributary to the Romans. But he is mistaken in supposing, as he seems to have done, that the publicans, so often mentioned in the New Testament, subsisted among them immediately from that conquest: for publicans were tax-gatherers in the Roman provinces. Now Judea was not reduced into the form of a province till the reign of Augustus, and some years after our Saviour's birth. Till then it was only a dependent kingdom, governed by its own kings; though not, as formerly, natives and chosen by the Jews, but appointed by the Roman emperors. Herod, who succeeded Antigonus, the last of the Asmonean race, was not a Jew, but an Idumean.*

Archelaus, Herod's son and successor, having committed many flagrant acts of mal-administration and tyranny, both the Jews and Samaritans sent ambassadors, to accuse him before Augustus. Upon which he was summoned to Rome, where not being able to clear himself of the crimes charged upon him, which were fully proved, he was deposed from his principality, after he had reigned ten years. This happened *Anno Dom.* 8, or in the 12th year of our Saviour's age.†

Augustus took this opportunity to reduce Judea into the form of a Roman province, and sent Publius Sulpitius Quirinius, afterward made president of Syria (the same who, according to the Greek way of writing his name, is called Cyrenius by St. Luke, chap. ii. 2), to seize the country over which Archelaus had reigned; and with him Coponius, a Roman of

* This hath made some suppose, that the sceptre departed from Judah, according to Jacob's prophecy, upon the accession of Herod. But that must be a mistake; since he acceded above thirty years before Shiloh, or the Messiah, came. The truth is, the sceptre was still amongst them, though he who swayed it was not a native.

† Dionysius Exiguus, a Roman abbot, who lived in the sixth century, and was the author of the Christian Era, fixed it, by mistake, four years after the birth of Christ. See Dupin's History of Ecclesiastical Writers, cent. vi. p. 42; Dr. Cave's Historia Literaria, sub anno 533, p. 333, edit. Genev. 1720; et Usserii Annales, ætat. mundi vii. ab init. p. 568, edit. Genev. 1722.

the equestrian order, to take upon him the government, under the title of procurator of Judea, yet in subordination to the president of Syria. It should seem the emperor had formed this design several years before, when he ordered the public census, or enrolment, of the subjects of the empire to extend to Judea; which occasioned the Virgin Mary's being at Bethlehem at the time of her delivery, ver. 1—5. But the reduction of Judea to the form of a province was not till twelve years after; and then taxes were first paid by its inhabitants immediately to the Roman state. For though the people of dependent kingdoms paid them to their own princes, and whatever the Romans received was from them, yet those of the provinces paid them directly to the Roman government, or to the officers which the senate appointed to collect and receive them.

The subject we have been upon naturally leads me to consider a difficulty, which hath occasioned the learned not a little trouble—the reconciling St. Luke's account of the enrolment, or census of the land of Judea, with Josephus.

Concerning the Census in the time of Augustus.

According to the Jewish historian, Josephus, Cyrenius was not governor of Syria till ten or twelve years after our Saviour's birth, after Archelaus was deposed, and the country brought under a Roman procurator;* whereas St. Luke says, *αυτη ἡ απογραφη πρωτη εγενετο ἡγεμονευοντος της Συριας Κυρηνιου*; which we render, "And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria," Luke ii. 2; yet this, according to him, was before the death of Herod, the father and predecessor of Archelaus, and in the same year when Christ was born.

Now as, on the one hand, it cannot be supposed, that a writer so accurate as Luke (were he considered only as a common historian) should make so gross a mistake as to confound the enrolment in the reign of Herod with that taxation under Cyrenius, which happened many years after; so, on the other hand, it is hard to conceive that Josephus should be

* Antiq. lib. xvii. cap. xiii. sect. ii. v.; et lib. xviii. cap. i. sect. i. ed. Haverc.

mistaken in an affair of so public a nature, so important to his own nation, and so recent when he wrote his history. To remove this difficulty,

1st. Some have supposed a corruption of the original text in Luke; and that, instead of Cyrenius, it ought to be read Saturninus, who, according to Josephus, was prefect of Syria within a year or two before Herod's death.

2dly. Others have thought it probable, that the original name in St. Luke was Quintilius; since Quintilius Varus succeeded Saturninus, and was in the province of Syria when Herod died.

But all the Greek manuscripts remonstrate against both these solutions. Therefore,

3dly. Mr. Whiston and Dr. Prideaux suppose that the words, "In those days there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world (or, as οικουμενη may be rendered, the whole land) should be taxed," ver. 1, refer to the time of making the census; and the subsequent words, "This taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria," ver. 2, to the time of levying the tax. Dr. Prideaux imagines this will answer all objections.*

4thly. Herwaert, and after him Dr. Whitby, render the text in this manner, "And this taxing was first made before that made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria.†

5thly. Dr. Lardner has given the easiest and best solution of this difficulty, rendering the words thus: "This was the first assessment of Cyrenius, governor of Syria." Which version he hath supported by substantial criticism; and likewise rendered it highly probable, that Cyrenius (afterward governor of Syria, and at the time St. Luke wrote, well known by that title) was employed in making the first enrolment of the inhabitants of Judea in the reign of Herod.‡

Of the Publicans.

Judea being now added to the provinces of the Roman

* Whiston's short View of the Harmony of the Evangelists, prop. xi., and Prideaux's Connect. part ii. book ix. sub anno 5 before the Christian era, vol. iv. p. 917—922, edit. 10.

† Herwaert's Nova et Vera Chronologia, p. 189, and Whitby in loc.

‡ See Credibility of the Gospel History, part i. vol. ii. book ii. ch. i.

empire, and the taxes paid by the Jews directly to the emperor, the publicans were the officers appointed to collect them.

Now the ordinary taxes which the Romans levied in the provinces, were of three sorts:

1st. Customs upon goods imported and exported; which tribute was therefore called *portorium*, from *portus*, a haven.

2dly. A tax upon cattle fed in certain pastures belonging to the Roman state, the number of which being kept in writing, this tribute was called *scriptura*.

3dly. A tax upon corn, of which the government demanded a tenth part. This tribute was called *decuma*.

We read of φορος and τελος, translated "tribute and custom;" Romans xiii. 7. Concerning the precise and distinct meaning of these words, the critics are much divided. Grotius makes φορος to signify a tax upon lands and persons; and τελος, custom upon goods and merchandise. Lipsius, by τελος understands a tax upon a real estate; by φορος, a tax upon moveables and persons. Leigh* supposes φορος to mean duties upon goods; τελος, a capitation or poll-tax. According to Beza, φορος signifies a capitation or poll-tax, and τελος includes all other taxes and duties. Other critics have given still different accounts. So that, in the midst of such great uncertainty, we must be content with this general observation, that these words together include all taxes and duties, though we are unable to ascertain the precise meaning of either of them, or the difference betwixt them. It being highly probable, that the public taxes varied from one age to another, I suspect, that in different ages these words were applied to different taxes and duties, which occasions an uncertainty about the precise idea to be affixed to them. Perhaps τελος was the more general name, or included the larger number of taxes, at least among the Greeks; which seems probable from the collectors, in their language, being called τελωναι; whereas in the Latin they are styled *publicani*, as being collectors of the public taxes, or revenue of the state.

These publicans are distinguished by Sigonius into three sorts or degrees, the farmers of the revenue, their partners,

* See his Critica Sacra, in verb.

and their securities,* in which he follows Polybius.† These are called the *mancipes, socii,* and *prædes;* who were all under the *quæstores ærarii,* that presided over the finances at Rome. The *mancipes* farmed the revenue of large districts, or provinces, had the oversight of the inferior publicans, received their accounts and collections, and transmitted them to the *quæstores ærarii.* They often let out their provinces in smaller parcels to the *socii;*‡ so called, because they were admitted to a share in the contract, perhaps for the sake of more easily raising the purchase-money; at least to assist in collecting the tribute. Both the *mancipes* and *socii* are therefore properly styled τελωναι, from τελος, *tributum,* and ωνεομαι, *emo.* They were obliged to procure *prædes,* or sureties,§ who gave security to the government for the fulfilment of the contract.‖ The distribution of Sigonius, therefore, or rather of Polybius, is not quite exact, since there were properly but two sorts of publicans, the *mancipes* and the *socii.*

The former are, probably, those whom the Greeks call αρχιτελωναι; of which sort was Zaccheus; Luke xix. 2. As they were much superior to the common publicans in dignity, being mostly of the equestrian order, so they were generally in their moral character. They are mentioned with great respect and honour by Cicero: "Flos," saith he, "equitum Romanorum, ornamentum civitatis, firmamentum reipublicæ,

* "Alii conducebant, alii cum his societatem coibant, alii pro his bona fortunasque reipublicæ obligabant." Sigon. de Antiq. Jure Civium Romanorum, lib. ii. cap. iv.

† Οι μεν γαρ αγοραζουσι παρα των τιμητων αυτοι τας εκδοσεις· οι δε κοινωνουσι τουτοις· οι δε εγγυωνται τας εγορακοτας· οι δε παν ουσιας διδεασιν περι τουτων εις το δημοσιον. "Alii enim à censoribus locationes per se emunt; alii cum his societatem habent; alii pro redemptoribus fidem suam interponunt; alii horum nomine bona sua in publicum addicunt." Polyb. Hist. lib. vi. tom. i. p. 646, edit. Gronov. Amstel. 1670.

‡ We meet frequently in Cicero with the Socii, and the Publicanorum Societates: Orat. pro Domo suâ, vol. v. sect. xxviii. p. 472, ed. Olivet.; and with the Principes, or Magistri Societatum, who were the Mancipes, Orat. pro Planc. vol. v. sect. ix. p. 545, et sect. 13, p. 548, et Epist. Famil. lib. xiii. epist. ix.; and the Digests mention the Socii vectigalium, lib. xxxix. tit. iv. leg. ix. sect. iv.

§ Called Fidejussores in the Digests, ubi supra, leg. ix. ab init.

‖ *Præs* signifies a surety for money, as *vas* does a surety in criminal matters.

publicanorum ordine continetur."* He likewise calls them "ordinem mihi commendatissimum."† But as for the common publicans, the collectors or receivers, as many of the *socii* were, they are spoken of with great contempt, by heathens as well as Jews; and particularly by Theocritus, who said, that "among the beasts of the wilderness, bears and lions are the most cruel; among the beasts of the city, the publican and parasite."‡ The reason of the general hatred to them was, doubtless, their rapine and extortion. For, having a share in the farm of the tribute, at a certain rate, they were apt to oppress the people with illegal exactions, to raise as large a fortune as they could for themselves. Besides, publicans were particularly odious to the Jews, who looked upon them to be the instruments of their subjection to the Roman emperors, to which they generally held it sinful for them to submit. For among the laws in Deuteronomy concerning the kings, there is in particular the following: "One from among thy brethren shalt thou set over thee; thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, who is not thy brother;" chap. xvii. 15. Now paying tribute to the Roman emperor they looked upon to be a virtual acknowledgment of his sovereignty. This, therefore, was a heavy grievance, and created an aversion to the collectors, as the instruments of illegal oppression, apart from all consideration of their rapacious practices. Accordingly, in the New Testament, we find them joined with harlots and heathens, and persons of the most profligate and infamous characters; and it was intended for a severe reproach of our Lord Jesus Christ, when he was said to be "a friend of publicans and sinners;" Luke vii. 34. Hence that ensnaring question was put to him, with a design "to entangle him in his talk," Matt. xxii. 15. 17, "Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar?" If he had denied it, it would have been judged an offence against the state; and if he had affirmed it, it would

* Orat. pro Plancio, apud Opera, vol. v. sect. ix. p. 544, edit. Olivet.

† Epist. Famil. lib. xiii. epist. x. apud Op. vol. vii. p. 442. Vid. etiam epist. ix. per totum, et Epist. ad Attic. lib. i. epist. xvii. vol. viii. p. 80.

‡ Vid. Hammond on Matt. ix. 10. The twelfth law, under the fourth title, in the thirty-first book of the Digests, is prefaced with these remarkable words: "Quantæ audaciæ, quantæ temeritatis sint publicanorum factiones, nemo est qui nesciat."

probably have exposed him to the rage and resentment of the people. It was on pretence of freeing them from this tributary yoke, that Judas of Galilee, or (as Josephus calls him) Judas Gaulanites, excited an "insurrection in the days of the taxing, and drew away much people after him;" Acts v. 37. Of this Josephus gives a particular account,* and saith, that when the census was first extended to Judea by Cyrenius, after Archelaus had been deposed by Augustus, the Jews were greatly chagrined at it; but at the persuasion of Joazer, the high-priest, they generally submitted. Yet, it seems, much against their wills; for when this Judas excited the people to rebellion, and to assert their liberty, they heard him, saith the historian, "with incredible pleasure," and made an insurrection on that account, under him as their leader.

Tertullian† imagined, that the publicans, among the Jews, were all heathens; which, not understanding Hebrew, he grounded on a spurious text in the Septuagint.‡ This opinion is confuted by the instances of Matthew and Zaccheus, who both appear to be Jews, by their names and their history. The latter is expressly said to be a son of Abraham; and as for Matthew, we may be assured, that our Lord, who, at present, was sent to none but the lost sheep of the house of Israel, would not have made an apostle of a Gentile. However, the Jews, who accepted the office of publicans, were, on that account, hated of their own nation equally with heathens, with whom they are sometimes ranked, Matt. xviii. 17; and, according to the rabbies, it was a maxim, "A religious man, who becomes a publican, is to be driven out of the society of religion."§

* Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. i. sect. i. edit. Haverc.

† De Pudĭcitiâ, sect. ix. p. 561, C. edit. Rigalt.

‡ Deut. xxiii. 18, in the Greek. The words are, ουκ εσαι τελεσφορος απο θυγατερων Ισραηλ, και ουκ εσαι τελισκομενος απο υιων Ισραηλ. They were probably at first a gloss in the margin, or inserted in the text of the Seventy from some other version; and are strangely misunderstood by Tertullian, who supposes τελεσφορος to signify, in this place, a publican, or tax-gatherer, which it most commonly does; but here it means a prostitute for hire, such as in the Pagan mysteries raised contributions by their lewdness. See Grotius and Le Clerc in loc.

§ See Lightfoot, Horæ Heb. on Matt. xviii. 17.

CHAPTER III.

ISRAELITES AND PROSELYTES.

Godwin distinguishes the people of Israel into two sorts, Hebrews and Proselytes. We may properly advance a step higher, and divide the whole world, after the commonwealth of Israel had been formed, into Jews and Gentiles.

The Jews, or Israelites, were those members of the Hebrew republic who worshipped the one true God according to the Mosaic ritual; all others they called גוים *goim*, Gentiles, and אמים *ummim*, the people, meaning, of the world, Psalm ii. 1. In the New Testament they are styled Ἕλληνες, Greeks; Rom. i. 16, and ii. 9, 10. When Greeks are opposed to barbarians,* the term signifies the learned, as distinguished from the illiterate part of mankind; the Greeks in those days being looked upon as a people of the most erudition, or at least their language being esteemed the most improved and polite. But when Greeks are opposed to Jews, they include the whole heathen world, of which the Greeks were the most considerable. Some have imagined, that the triple distinction which St. Paul makes, Gal. iii. 28, "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female," refers to a form of thanksgiving which the Jews are said to have repeated in their daily prayers; wherein they gave thanks to God for these three things: that he had made them Jews, and not Gentiles; that he had made them free, and not bond-men, or slaves; that he had made them men, and not women. Instead of the third article, the women thanked God that he had made them as it pleased him. If this

* As by St. Paul, Rom. i. 14, and by heathen authors: αντικειται γαρ τῳ Ἕλληνι ὁ βαρβαρος,—"The barbarian is opposed to the Greek." Thucyd. lib. i. sect. iii. Schol. v. p. 3, edit. Huds. Oxon. 1696. Διχα διαιρουντας απαν το των ανθρωπων πληθος εις Ἕλληνας και βαρβαρους,—"dividing the whole world into Greeks and barbarians." Strab. lib. ii. p. 45, edit. Casaub. Paris, 1620.

form was, indeed, as ancient as the time of the apostle, it may naturally be supposed that he referred to it in this passage, where he is showing that the peculiar prerogatives and privileges which the Jews enjoyed under the Old Testament, were by the gospel equally extended to the Gentiles; and that all who believe in Christ, without regard to their nation, worldly condition, or sex, are admitted into his church, and made partakers of his salvation.

We now come to consider the distinction of the members of the commonwealth of Israel, into Hebrews and Proselytes.

1st. As to the Hebrews: The learned are divided concerning the derivation and meaning of this word, which so often occurs both in the Old and New Testament. We find it first applied to Abraham, Gen. xiv. 13; and in a multitude of places to his posterity, to distinguish them from all other people; particularly from the Egyptians, Gen. xliii. 32; and the Philistines, 1 Sam. iv. 9.

The more common opinion concerning its meaning, maintained by the Jewish rabbies, and espoused by Buxtorff the son,* is,

1st. That it is *appellatio patronymica*, a family name, from Eber, who was the great grandson of Shem, and Abraham's great, great, great, great grandfather; that is, he was a lineal descendant from Eber in the seventh generation.†

Two queries will naturally be started upon this opinion:

1st. Why Abraham and his posterity should take their name from so remote a progenitor as Eber;—or if from a remote one, why not from Shem, the first father and founder of the family after Noah?

2dly. Why this appellation should be given to Abraham and his family, rather than to any other of Eber's posterity?

In answer to the first query, the rabbies tell us, that Eber was a man of singular piety; that the primitive religion and language were preserved by him and his family; and that Abraham and his posterity are called Hebrews, because they spoke the same language, and professed and practised the same religion, that Eber did.

* See his Dissert. de Linguæ Hebraicæ Conservatione, apud Dissertat. Philolog. Theolog. p. 147, Basil. 1662.

† See the genealogy of Abraham's family, Gen. xi. 10, &c.

But this reason seems to have its principal foundation in the national pride of the Jews, who would have us believe, that their language was spoken in Paradise, and their ancestors peculiarly favoured of God above all other people, even long before the call of Abraham. But Le Clerc has rendered it highly probable, that the Hebrew was the language of the Canaanites, and that Abraham, whose original tongue was the language of the Chaldee (for he came out of Ur of the Chaldees, Gen. xv. 7), learnt it, as Isaac and Jacob and their families did, by dwelling in the land of Canaan.* However that be, it remains to be proved, that the Hebrew language is the same which Eber spoke. What they say of his singular piety is *gratis dictum;* and their account of the true religion being preserved in his family down to Abraham's time, by no means agrees with Joshua's saying, that the ancestors of the Israelites, who in old time dwelt "on the other side of the flood, even Terah, the father of Abraham, served other gods;" Josh. xxiv. 2.

The second query is, Why the name Hebrew should be given to Abraham and his family, rather than to any other of Eber's posterity; for Eber had other sons and daughters, besides Peleg, his son in the line of Abraham? Gen. xi. 17.

The common reply is, because the blessings of the covenant of grace were limited to that line of Eber's posterity, which reached down to Abraham. On this account, as it is supposed, Shem is called "the father of the children of Eber;" and not so much because he was their natural progenitor; which he was, likewise, of many other families and nations. And as the posterity of Isaac and Jacob, and not that of Ishmael and Esau, are called the children of Abraham, so the posterity of Eber are the children of Shem, κατ' εξοχην.

Still the idolatry of Abraham's nearer progenitors may be urged as an objection; and it is reasonable to ask, whether the blessings of the covenant were continued to those fathers or ancestors of Abraham, who served other gods? Indeed, that they were limited to Shem's posterity in the line of Eber, before the calling of Abraham, is *gratis dictum*. This opinion also of the rabbies savours too much of the before-mentioned pride. But,

* See his Prolegom. to the Pentateuch, diss. i.

2dly. There is another opinion concerning this appellation, as applied to Abraham and his posterity, which hath a greater appearance of probability: that it comes from the preposition עבר *gnebher, trans;* from whence those that lived beyond, or to the east of the river Euphrates, were called by the Canaanites and others who lived on the west, עברים *gnibhrim.* Thus Abraham's family, before his call into Canaan, is said to have dwelt בעבר הנהר *bengnebher hannahar, trans fluvium,* Josh. xxiv. 2; meaning, beyond the river Euphrates; which being the greatest river in that part of the world, or that was known to the ancient inhabitants of the adjacent countries, they used to call it "the river," κατ' εξοχην. And the people who lived east or west of it, styled those on the other side, "the people beyond the river," that is, *trans Euphratenses.* Thus the enemies of the Jews, who wrote from Judea to king Artaxerxes in Babylon, styled themselves "thy servants on this side of the river," Ezra iv. 11; and the king in his answer directs to them "beyond the river;" ver. 17. In the Chaldee, indeed, the phrase is the same in both places, עבר נהרה *gnabhar naharah, trans fluvium;* and elsewhere we meet with this expression, Hadarezer "brought out the Assyrians that were beyond the river;" 2 Sam. x. 16. Now it is according to this phraseology, so common in Scripture, that Le Clerc understands the account we have, that "Shem was the father of all the children of Eber," Gen. x. 21, that is, of all the people who dwelt east of the Euphrates; translating כל בני עבר *col bene gnebher, omnes qui trans fluvium degunt.* He takes בני עבר *bene gnebher* to be a Hebraism, denoting the inhabitants of the country beyond the Euphrates. So the sense of the text is, that all this eastern part of the world was peopled by Shem's posterity.

It is supposed that the Canaanites called Abraham, in their language, the Hebrew, because he came בעבר *bengnebher,* from beyond the river. Thus Josephus says, that Niger, the president of Idumea, was called Περαιτης, because γενος ην εκ της περι Ιορδανην περαιας, *quod a trans-Jordanensi regione oriundus esset.** And hence the posterity of Abraham acquired the appellation of עברים *gnibhrim,* or Hebrews.

* De Bello Jud. lib. ii. cap. xx: sect. iv: edit. Haverc.

It is evident the Seventy understood the word in this sense, for they translate Abraham the Hebrew, Gen. xiv. 13, Abraham περατης, *transitor*. Thus, among the ancients, Theodoret,* and Jerome,† as well as some others,‡ and among the moderns, Grotius and Le Clerc, understand the word Hebrew.

On the whole, according to this opinion, Hebrew signifies much the same as foreigner among us; or one that comes from beyond sea. Such were Abraham and his family among the Canaanites; and his posterity, learning and using the language of the country, still retained the appellation originally given them, even when they became possessors and settled inhabitants. In which circumstance the church of Israel was, in some sort, a type of that larger church of the Gentiles, which was to be called and gathered to Christ, and "to forget her own people and her father's house," Psalm xlv. 10; as Abraham's family being called out of an idolatrous nation, no longer retained the name of the people from whence they sprung, but were afterwards called Hebrews or foreigners.

It is further very probable, that the Israelites being called גרים *gerim*, strangers, in David's time, 1 Chron. xxix. 15, might refer to their fathers having come into the country over the גר *gar*, *alveus*, that is, the Euphrates.

It is, however, objected to this opinion,

1st. That according to this sense of the word, the posterity of Ishmael and Esau might as well have been called Hebrews as the posterity of Isaac and Jacob, they being equally the posterity of Abraham the foreigner, who came בעבר *bengnebher*, from beyond the river.

To this it may be replied, that very probably they were called Hebrews while they continued in Abraham's family; but afterward, when they separated themselves from it, and were incorporated into the Canaanitish and other nations by intermarriage, they were no longer looked upon as foreigners, and so lost that name. Besides, there were personal reasons for Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob being called Hebrews, which did not affect either Ishmael or Esau. Abraham was born beyond the river, where he passed the younger part of his

* In Gen. quæst. 60. † In Iesai xix. 18.

‡ See Buxtorfii Dissert. Philolog. Theolog. dissert. iii. p. 141, 142.

life. Isaac would not marry a Canaanite, but went beyond the river for a wife. Jacob did the same, and dwelt there for upwards of twenty years; and there all his children, except one, were born. But none of these reasons held for continuing the same appellation to Ishmael and Esau, and their posterity.

2dly. It is objected, that the word Hebrew is a name or title of honour. As such St. Paul uses it, 2 Cor. xi. 22: "Are they Hebrews? So am I." And can we suppose, that Jews would glory in being foreigners, and in their ancestors coming out of an idolatrous country?

To this it may be answered, that names are often used in a good or bad sense, very different from the import of their derivation. The word knave hath now a very bad meaning, though it is derived from *gnavus*, diligent or active, and though formerly it signified a servant, in whom diligence is a very good quality. Who, when he glories in being an Englishman, considereth the derivation and original signification of the word English? Besides, it was really an honour to the Jews, that God was pleased to call Abraham, the father and founder of their nation, out of an idolatrous country, in which he had been born and educated, and to separate him and his posterity from all other nations, to be his peculiar people and visible church.

A farther reason of St. Paul's glorying in his being an Hebrew, and consequently a farther answer to this objection, will be shortly produced.

3dly. Another objection against the second, and in favour of the first opinion, is taken from Balaam's prophecy: "And ships shall come from the coast of Chittim, and shall afflict Ashur, and shall afflict Eber," Numb. xxiv. 24, two branches of Shem's family; Gen. x. 22. 24. Now, if it be admitted, that the Assyrians were called by the name of Ashur, because he was their primogenitor; can it be reasonably denied, or doubted, that the Jews are called Hebrews from Eber?

I reply, If by Eber be, in this place, meant the Jews, this argument will have considerable weight. But if the prophecy refers to Alexander's conquest, which Grotius says is very plain, *quod nemo non videt*, then Eber cannot here mean the people of Israel, since they were not afflicted by Alexander,

as other nations were, but remarkably and miraculously preserved from his ravages. If, therefore, we take the word Eber to come from עבר *gnebher, trans,* it must here mean, as Grotius and Le Clerc understand it, the other nations (as well as the Assyrians) that lay east of the river Euphrates.

Thus much for the derivation and import of the word Hebrew.

There is a very remarkable appellation which the apostle Paul, after glorying in his being "of the stock of Israel, and of the tribe of Benjamin," applies to himself, namely, that he was "an Hebrew of the Hebrews;" Phil. iii. 5. By this expression Godwin understands an Hebrew both by father's and mother's side. But if this be all that the phrase imports, there seems to be very little occasion for the apostle's using it immediately after having declared, that he was "of the stock of Israel, and the tribe of Benjamin;" which, on Godwin's supposition, is the same as an Hebrew of the Hebrews; for the Jews were not allowed to marry out of their own nation: or if they sometimes married proselytes, yet their number was comparatively so small among them, especially while they were under oppression, as they were at that time by the Romans, that methinks Paul would hardly have mentioned it as a distinguishing privilege and honour, that neither of his parents were proselytes. It is therefore a much more probable sense, that a Hebrew of the Hebrews signifies a Hebrew both by nation and language, which multitudes of Abraham's posterity, in those days, were not; or one of the Hebrew Jews, who performed their public worship in the Hebrew tongue; for such were reckoned more honourable than the Hellenistic Jews, who in their dispersion having, in a manner, lost the Hebrew, used the Greek language *in sacris,* and read the Scripture out of the Septuagint version. We meet with this distinction amongst the converted Jews, in the Acts of the Apostles: "In those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians or Hellenists against the Hebrews;" Acts vi. 1. This is what St. Paul probably meant by his being a Hebrew, as distinguished from an Israelite; 2 Cor. xi. 22. "Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I." In one sense, these were convertible terms, both signifying Jews by nation

and religion; but in the sense just mentioned, there were many, in those days, who were Israelities, but not Hebrews. St. Paul was both, not only an Israelite by birth, but a Hebrew, and not an Hellenistic Jew.

Godwin expresses himself inaccurately, when he saith, that those who lived in Palestine, and who, as using the Hebrew text in their public worship, were opposed to the Ἑλληνισται, are called Hebrews, or JEWS. For, though Hebrew and Jew are convertible terms, when opposed to Gentiles, as denoting the seed of Abraham, and professors of the Mosaic religion, see Jer. xxxiv. 9; yet, as opposed to the Ἑλληνισται, they are not convertible terms, there being Hebrew Jews and Hellenistic Jews; for it is said, that when "they, who were scattered by the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled into several countries, preaching the word to none but Jews only," yet they spoke, προς τους Ἑλληνιστας, to the Hellenists or Grecians; Acts xi. 19, 20.*

In order to confirm the sense which I have given of the word Ἑλληνισται, in opposition to the appellation Hebrews, it is proper we should take notice of the distinction between the Ἑλληνες and Ἑλληνισται. The former were Greeks by nation, and as such distinguished from Jews, Acts xvi. 1; xix. 10; and the Greek empire having been rendered by Alexander in a manner universal, and their language being then the most common and general, the appellation Greeks is sometimes

* In the strictest sense, this appellation יהודים Jehudim, Ιουδαιοι, or Jews, belongs only to the posterity and tribe of Judah. Hebrews, in the full extent of the word, were the posterity of Abraham the Hebrew; Israelites, the posterity of Jacob, or Israel; and Jews, the posterity of Judah, one of the sons of Israel. But after the division of Abraham's and Israel's posterity into two kingdoms, under Rehoboam and Jeroboam, the one was called the kingdom of Judah, because the tribe of Judah had the greater part of it, and also because the kings were of that tribe; the other, consisting of ten tribes, was called the kingdom of Israel. From hence arose a distinction between Jews and Israelites. Thus, by the Jews which the king of Assyria drove from Elath, 2 Kings xvi. 6, are meant the subjects of the kingdom of Judah; for to that kingdom Elath had been restored by Azariah some years before; 2 Kings xiv. 22. But as the ten tribes were afterward, in a manner, lost in the Assyrian captivity (as hath been shown before), and the kingdom of Judah only continued through succeeding ages a body politic, the name Jews came to be applied indifferently to all Hebrews and Israelites.

given to the whole heathen world, or to all who were not Jews; Rom. i. 16; ii. 9.

These Greeks, called Ἑλληνικοι by Josephus, are always styled Ἑλληνες in the New Testament. On which account Grotius, understanding by the Ἑλληνισται, or "Grecians, to whom some of those who were dispersed on the persecution which arose about Stephen, preached the Lord Jesus," Acts xi. 19, 20, Greeks by nation, concludes there is a mistake in the text, and alters it according to the Syriac and Vulgate versions: "certe legendum," saith he, "προς τους Ἑλληνας." So indeed the Alexandrian manuscript reads, but is supported by no other copy. And which, I think, is decisive against it, it is evident, from the words immediately preceding, that these Grecians were by nation Jews, and not Greeks, it being expressly said, that those who were scattered on the persecution "preached the gospel to the Jews only." As for the Ἑλληνες, or Greeks, mentioned in St. John's Gospel, chap. xii. 20, as being come to Jerusalem at the passover to worship in the temple, and likewise those mentioned in the Acts, as worshipping along with the Jews in the synagogues; chap. xiv. 1; xviii. 4; they were doubtless Greeks by birth and nation, yet proselytes to the Jewish religion. There is a distinction made between Jews and proselytes, Acts ii. 10; but none between Hebrews and proselytes, because a proselyte might be either an Hebrew or an Hellenist, according to the language in which he performed public worship.

That the Hellenists, or Grecians, were Jews, is further argued from the account we have, chap. ix. 29, that when at Jerusalem St. Paul "disputed against the Grecians, they went about to slay him," as the Jews at Damascus had done before, ver. 23. Now had these Grecians been strangers of a different nation, it cannot be imagined they durst have attempted to kill a Jew, among his own countrymen, in the capital, and without a formal accusation of him before any of their tribunals.

Upon the whole, the Ἑλληνισται, or Grecians, being Jews who used the Greek tongue in their sacred exercises, the Hebrew Jews and Grecian Jews were distinguished in those days, in like manner as the Portuguese and Dutch Jews are among us, not so much by the place of their birth (many be-

ing born in England, others abroad), as by the language they use in their public prayers and sermons.

I have already observed, that the language which the Grecians used *in sacris*, was that of the Septuagint, which is likewise the language of the New Testament. It hath been, therefore, by some called the Hellenistic tongue, to distinguish it from pure Greek, while others, rejecting the distinction, assert the purity of the New Testament Greek. A considerable dispute hath hereupon arisen in the learned world, with which it is proper we should not be unacquainted.

Concerning the Language of the New Testament.

Scaliger, observing that the phraseology in the New Testament agrees with that of the Septuagint, calls it the Hellenistic dialect. Heinsius imagined it to be a language different from the pure Greek, as the Italian is from the Latin, and peculiar to the Hellenists; a people, he supposes, who dwelt in Asia, and in several of those eastern parts. He was opposed by Salmasius.* Phocenius, also, engaged in this controversy, and maintained the purity of the New Testament Greek. To him Gataker replied in his piece, De Stylo Novi Testamenti.

The common opinion is, that the Greek of the New Testament is neither pure, nor a new language; but may properly be called the Hellenistic dialect; inasmuch as the words are sometimes used in a different sense, and different construction, from what they are in other authors. There is, also, a mixture of Latin, Persic, and Syro-chaldaic words, besides solecisms and Hebraisms.

1st. The following Latin words are mentioned: κοδραντης, *quadrans*, Matt. v. 26; κηνσος, *census*, chap. xvii. 25; δηναριον, *denarius*, chap. xviii. 28; λεγεων, *legio*, chap. xxvi. 53; πραιτωριον, *prætorium*, chap. xxvii. 27; κουστωδια, *custodia*, ver. 65;

* "Hebræus nomen gentis est," saith Salmasius, "Hellenistes dialecti. Hoc convenit omnibus hominibus græcè scientibus et loquentibus, quia gentem non denotat, sed omnem hominem ἑλληνιξοντα." De Linguâ Hellenistica Comment. p. 191, edit. Lugd. Bat. 1643; in support of which piece he published the same year his Funus Linguæ Hellenisticæ, against Heinsius's Exercitat. de Hellenistis et Ling. Hellenist.

σπεκουλατωρ, *spiculator*, Mark vi. 27; κεντυριων, *centurio*, chap. xv. 39; κολωνια, *colonia*, Acts xvi. 12; σουδαριον, *sudarium*, chap. xix. 12; μακελλον, *macellum*, 1 Cor. x. 25; μεμβρανα, *membrana*, 2 Tim. iv. 13.

Instances of Latin phrases are συμβουλιον λαβειν, *concilium capere*, Matt. xii. 14; εργασιαν δουναι, *operam dare*, Luke xii. 58. Besides Latin, there are,

2dly. Persic words; as μαγοι, *magi*, Matt. ii. 1; γαζα, *thesaurus*, Acts viii. 27 (the proper Greek word is θησαυρος); and likewise γαζοφυλακιον, John viii. 20. There are also,

3dly. Syro-chaldaic words; as, Αββα, Mark xiv. 36; Ακελδαμα, Acts i. 19; βηθεσδα, John v. 2; Εφφαθα, Mark vii. 34; Γολγοθα, Matt. xxvii. 33; κορβαν, Mark vii. 11; ρακα, Matt. v. 22: and whole sentences; as Ελωι, Ελωι, λαμμα σαβαχθανι, Mark xv. 34; μαραν αθα, 1 Cor. xvi. 22; Ταλιθα, κουμι, Mark v. 41.

Various instances of solecisms are alleged; as, ἡ καινη διαθηκη εν τῳ αιματι μου, το ὑπερ ὑμων εκχυνομενον, for εκχυνομενῳ, which it should be in regular construction with τῳ αιματι, Luke xxii. 20. And the following: απο Ιησου Χριστου, ὁ μαρτυς, ὁ πιστος —τῳ αγαπησαντι ἡμας—και εποιησεν ἡμας, &c., Rev. i. 5, 6. Again, ὁ νικων, δωσω αυτῳ, &c., chap. iii. 21. In like manner, ὁ νικων, ποιησω αυτον στυλον, &c., ver. 12. And also, την δοξαν αυτου,—πληρης χαριτος, &c., John i. 14.

Several methods have been taken to make out the grammatical construction of these passages. But the attempt is needless; Gataker* having shown, that such solecisms are common in the purest Greek writers: and, indeed, they are often looked upon as beauties, rather than blemishes.

Hebraisms are observed in abundance, and that both in words and phrases, in construction and in figures.

In the first place, Hebraisms in single words are of three sorts:—such as are properly of a Hebrew extract: such as are indeed of a Greek extract, but used in a different sense from what they are in other authors, and in a manner conformable to the Hebrew: and words, new coined, to translate Hebrew words by.

* Annot. in Marc. Antonin. lib. iii. sect. iv.

1st. There are words of an Hebrew extract, which have either a Greek termination, as Μεσσιας, John i. 42; Σατανας, Matt. iv. 10; σικερα, Luke i. 15, *potus inebrians*, from שכר *shechar:* or others which retain the Hebrew termination, as Αλληλουια, Rev. xix. 1; σαβαωθ, Rom. ix. 29; Αβαδδων, Rev. ix. 11.

2dly. There are Greek words, used in a different sense from what they are in other authors, and in a manner conformable to the Hebrew; as βιβλος for a catalogue, like ספר *sepher;* βιβλος γενεσεως Ιησου Χριστου, Matt. i. 1; ספר תולדת אדם *sepher toledhoth Adam*, Gen. v. 1. Εις, μια, εν, is always a cardinal, except in the New Testament, where it is frequently an ordinal, like אחד *achedh*, in Hebrew; as, της μιας σαββατων, Mark xvi. 2, *primo die hebdomadis*, or πρωτη σαββατου, as it is presently after explained, ver. 9: Κατα μιαν σαββατων, 1 Cor. xvi. 2: like באחד לחדש *beechadh lachodesh*, the first day of the month. Ῥημα in Greek signifies a word, but in the New Testament it sometimes signifies a thing; like דבר *dhabhar;* ὁτι ουκ αδυνατησει παρα τῳ Θεῳ παν ῥημα, Luke i. 37. Αποκρινομαι signifies properly, to answer when another hath already spoken; but in the New Testament it is used for taking occasion to speak, without having been spoken to; like ענה *gnanah*, in Hebrew: Και αποκριθεις ὁ Ιησους ειπεν αυτη, *nempe*, συκη· Μηκετι εκ σου εις τον αιωνα ουδεις καρπον φαγοι· "And Jesus answering, said to the fig-tree," &c., Mark xi. 14. Εξομολογειν strictly means, to confess; but in the New Testament, to thank or praise; which is evidently a translation of the Hebrew word הודה *hodhah*, in Hiphil, from ידה *jadhah;* "And at that time Jesus answered and said, Εξομολογουμαι σοι, πατερ, κυριε του ουρανου και της γης, ὁτι απεκρυψας ταυτα," &c. Περαν signifies *trans*, as beyond, or on the other side of a river; but in the New Testament it is used for near to, without determining on which side. Thus we read of "the land of Zabulon, and the land of Naphthali, by the way of the sea, περαν του Ιορδανου, Galilee of the Gentiles," Matt. iv. 15; that is, near, or about Jordan; for neither Zabulon, nor Naphthali, nor Galilee of the Gentiles, were beyond (as our translators have expressed it), but near Jordan. Περαν, then, is a translation of עבר *gnebher*, which signifies near to, on either side, as well as beyond.

Thus Moses is said to have stood בעבר הירדן *bengnebher hajjarden*, Deut. i. 1; that is, near Jordan, for he never went over it into Canaan; Deut. xxxii. 52. There are,

3dly. Some words new coined, to translate Hebrew words by; as *αναθηματιζω*, for חרם *charam*; *ὁ δε ηρξατο αναθεματιζειν και ομνυειν· ὁτι ουκ οιδα τον ανθρωπον*, &c., Mark xiv. 71. *Σπλαγχνιζομαι*, a word formed to translate רחם *racham, intimè dilexit*: *ὁ δε Ιησους—ειπε, σπλαγχνιζομαι επι τον οχλον, ὁτι ηδου ημερας τρεις προσμενουσι μοι, και ουκ εχουσι τι φαγωσι*, Matt. xv. 32. *Χαριτοω*, to translate חנן *chanan, gratiosus fuit*: *Ὁ αγγελος προς αυτην ειπε, Χαιρε, κεχαριτωμενη*, Luke i. 28.

Secondly. Hebraisms in phrases, are either,

1st. Such as have not been used by other Greek authors: as, seeing of life and death, for living and dying: *Πιστει Ενωχ μετετεθη του μη ιδειν θανατον*, Heb. xi. 5. In like manner the Hebrew, ולא יראה-מות *velo jireh-maveth;* Psalm lxxxix. 49 Heb., 48 Engl. Again, *εξελευθοτας εκ της οσφυος Αβρααμ*, is analogous to the following expression: "All the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt, יצאי ירכו *jotse jerecho*, who came out of his loins," &c., Gen. xlvi. 25 Heb., 26 Engl. Or,

2dly. Such as have not been used by other Greek writers in the same sense as in the New Testament; as, to hear the voice of a person, signifies, to obey: *Πας ὁ ων εκ της αληθειας, ακουει μου της φωνης*, John xviii. 37, parallel with כי שמעת לקול ישתך *chi shemangta lekol ishteka;* Gen. iii. 17. To eat bread, signifies, to sit down to a meal; *Ου γαρ νιπτονται τας χειρας αυτων, ὁταν αρτον εσθιωσιν*, Matt. xv. 2, which is an expression parallel to this, "And they made ready the present against Joseph came at noon; for they heard, כי שם יאכלו לחם *chi sham jochelu lachem*, that they should eat bread there;" Gen. xliii. 24 Heb., 25 Engl.

There are also pleonasms in the Greek Testament, such as do not occur in other Greek authors. As, *Επαρας ουν ὁ Ιησους τους οφθαλμους και θεασαμενος ὁτι πολυς*, &c. "When Jesus then lift up his eyes and saw a great company," &c., John vi. 5. Parallel to this in the Hebrew, וישא אברהם את-עיניו וירא *vajjissa Abraham eth-gneinaiv vajjare:* "And Abraham lift up his eyes, and saw the place," &c. Gen. xxii. 4. Again, *Ομοθυμαδον ηραν φωνην προς τον Θεον, και ειπον*, "they lift up their voice to God with one accord, and said," Acts iv. 24: like the follow-

ing in the Hebrew: "And when they told it to Jotham, he went and stood in the top of mount Gerizim, and lift up his voice, and cried, and said unto them, וישא קולו ויקרא ויאמר *vajjissa kolo vajjikra vajjomer*;" Judges ix. 7. Again, Εκτεινας την χειρα ηψατο αυτου ὁ Ιησους, "Jesus put forth his hand, and touched him," &c.; Matt. viii. 3. Like that expression concerning Noah, וישלח ידו ויקחה ויבא *vajjishlach jadho vajjakkacheha vajjabhee*; "And he put forth his hand, and took her" (the dove), "And pulled her in unto him into the ark;" Gen. viii. 9.

Thirdly. There are constructions in the New Testament, which are said to be Hebraisms: as,

1st. The feminine gender for the neuter: Διθον ον απεδοκιμασαν ὁι οικοδομουντες, αυτος εγενηϑη εις κεφακην γωνιας· παρα Κυριου εγενετο αυτη, και εστι ϑαυμαστη, &c.; Matt. xxi. 42. היתה לראש פנה מאת יהוה היתה זאת היא נפלאת *hajethah lerosh pinnah, mèeth Jehovah hajethah zoth hi niphlath*, &c.; Psalm cxviii. 23. In like manner, אחת שאלתי מאת-יהוה אותה אבקש *achath shaalti mèeth Jehovah othah abakkesh*; Psalm xxvii. 4. Some, indeed, make κεφαλην to be the antecedent to αυτη (פנה *pinnah* to היא *hi*), and not the whole preceding sentence; and they render the clause, παρα Κυριου εγενετο αυτη, *à Domino constitutus est ille angularis*; agreeable to the sense of εγενετο in this passage, Το σαββατον δια τον ανϑρωπον εγενετο, Mark ii. 27.

2dly. A noun repeated twice to express a distribution into several parts; as, "He commanded them all to sit down, συμποσια συμποσια, by companies, and they sat, πρασιαι πρασιαι, in ranks," Mark vi. 39, 40: like this Hebrew expression, "He delivered them into the hands of his servants, עדר עדר *gnedher, gnedher*, every drove by themselves;" Gen. xxxii. 16. Again, "He called unto him the twelve, and began to send them forth, δυο δυο, by two and two," Mark vi. 7; like the following Hebrew phrase, "of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee, שבעה שבעה *shibhngnah shibhngnah*, by sevens;" Gen. vii. 2. The regular expression is ανα δυο, as it is in the parallel place, Luke x. 1.

3dly. The superlative degree expressed by the addition of Θεος: "In which time Moses was born, and was αστειος τω Θεω, exceeding fair;" Acts vii. 20. Thus, in Hebrew it is

said, "Nineveh was, עיר-גדולה לאלהים *gnir gadholah lelohim*, an exceeding great city; Jonah iii. 3.

4thly. Some verbs are said to be used with different constructions from what they are in other Greek authors; as προσκυνεω with a dative case: λεπρος ελθων προσεκυνει αυτω, Matt. viii. 2. Again, και προσεκυνησαν αυτω, John ix. 38; whereas in other authors it governs an accusative. So also ειναι εις τι, for ειναι τι, is said to be an Hebraism: "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and cleave to his wife, και εσονται οι δυο εις σαρκα μιαν," Matt. xix. 5. "Unto them who be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, ουτος εγενηθη εις κεφαλην γωνιας," 1 Pet. ii. 7. Thus in Hebrew, "God is the Lord, and he hath enlightened us," ויאר לנו *vajjaer lanu;* Psalm cxviii. 27.

Fourthly. There are Hebrew figures observed in the New Testament; as,

1st. Enallage of the case, person, number, and gender. Enallage of the case, Ὁ νικων, δωσω αυτω, &c., Rev. ii. 26; Ὁ νικων, ποιησω αυτον, Rev. iii. 12; Ελαλησε προς τους πατερας ἡμων, τω Αβρααμ, και τω σπερματι αυτου, Luke i. 55; Παν ῥημα αργον, αποδωσουσι περι αυτου λογον, Matt. xii. 36; Λιθον, ον απεδοκιμασαν, ουτος εγενηθη, &c., Matt. xxi. 42; Ὁ γαρ Μωσης ουτος—ουκ οιδαμεν τι γεγονεν αυτω, Acts vii. 40. See the like kind of expression in the Hebrew, תמים דרכו : האל *Hael, tamim, darco;* Psalm xviii. 30.

Enallage of the person: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent προς αυτην, how often would I have gathered τα τεκνα σου," Matt. xxiii. 37. Thus in the Hebrew: "I was wroth with my people, עמי-על קצפתי *katsaphti gnal-gnammi,* &c., thou didst show them no mercy, לא-שמת לחם רחמים *lo-samt lahem rachamim;*" Isa. xlvii. 6.

Enallage of number: "At that time Jesus went τοις σαββασι δια των σποριμων," Matt. xii. 1. And,

Of gender: "Not holding την κεφαλην, εξ ου, the whole body by joints and bands," &c.; Col. ii. 19.

2dly. Pleonasms are said to be borrowed from the Hebrew. I have mentioned some already, and shall add the following: "That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, εφ' ους επικεκληται το ονομα μου επ' αυτους,"

Acts xv. 17. Thus in the Hebrew, "Every place," &c. אשר תדרך כף-רגלכם בו *asher tidhrok caph-raglechem bo;* Josh. i. 3. Again; "To the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, *οπου τρεφεται εκει,*" Rev. xii. 14. Similar to this instance in the Hebrew: "Then said Saul to his servant, Well said; come, let us go: so they went unto the city אשר-שם איש האלהים *asher-sham ish Haelohim;*" 1 Sam. ix. 10. Again, Pilate said, *Αθωος ειμι απο του αιματος,* &c., Matt. xxvii. 24; and St. Paul, *ὁτι καθαρος εγω απο του αιματος παντων,* Acts xx. 26, where *απο* seems to be redundant. The following is a similar Hebrew expression: "When David heard it, he said, נקי אנכי—מדמי אבנר *naki anchi—middeme Abnèr;*" 2 Sam. iii. 28.

3dly. Ellipsis is a common figure in the New Testament, after the manner of the Hebrew: for instance, "Behold I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and Scribes. *Και εξ αυτων αποκτενειτε και σταυρωσετε, και εξ αυτων μαστιγωσετε,*" &c., Matt. xxiii. 34. Like the following expression in the Second Book of Kings: "And Jehu went—into the house of Baal, and said unto the worshippers of Baal, Search and look, lest there be here with you מעבדי יהוה *mèngnabhdhè Jehovah;*" 2 Kings x. 23.

However, after all the exceptions to the purity of the New Testament Greek, it hath as able critics among its advocates as any that have appeared on the contrary side, particularly Mr. Blackwall, who, in his Sacred Classics, maintains the language of the New Testament to be not only pure, but very elegant Greek. He hath vindicated, with great learning, the several passages excepted against, producing parallel ones out of the purest authors. He denies there are any solecisms, having not only well supported the suspected places, but generally shown a peculiar beauty in them. It is a remark of Mr. Addison, that the most exquisite words and finest strokes of an author are those which often appear the most doubtful and exceptionable to a man who wants a relish for polite learning, and which a sour undistinguishing critic attacks with the greatest violence. Tully observes, that it is very easy to brand or fix a mark, upon what he calls *verbum ardens,* a bold, glowing expression, and to turn it into ridicule by a cold, ill-na-

tured criticism. Blackwall acknowledges the New Testament hath words and expressions not to be found in any classic author; nor could it be otherwise, when it treats of things which the heathens had no ideas of, nor any words for. New names must be given to new things. In this respect no other liberty is taken than is freely done by Tully, Plato, and the greatest genuises of all ages.

As for the mixture of foreign words, especially Latin, there are not many. However, in the use of these few, the sacred writers are equally to be vindicated, at least, with the Greek classics, who have many foreign, particularly Persic words. For, as the most eminent of them flourished at a time when the empire of the Persians was of vast extent, and had a great influence on the affairs of Greece, many of their words became familiar to, and were adopted by the Greeks. In the times of the apostles and evangelists, the Roman empire having extended its conquests over all the countries where Greek was spoke, by that means Roman words and phrases crept in, as before Persic had done. As to Hebraisms, the reason why the New Testament writers mingled them with their Greek, does not seem to be owing so much to their being Hebrews, as to their discoursing of many things relating to the Mosaic law, and capable of being well expressed in the Hebrew language, which could not be expressed so happily, if at all, in any other. So that if they had declined using the Hebrew idiom, they must have invented new words and phrases, which would not have been easily or soon understood. Mr. Blackwall observes, that in common morals, in matters of conversation and historical narrative, they use the same words and phrases with Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, &c., and that they do not more differ from the classics in their form of expression, than these do from one another.

A great many expressions, originally Hebraisms, have, by the best authors, been transplanted into the Greek tongue, and are now become proper and genuine phrases. But the sacred writers, being better acquainted with the Hebrew language, have remarkably enriched their style from that inexhaustible mine, to which the Greeks had little access.

Upon the whole, he is confident, that if a man reads the New Testament with a heart as much prepossessed in its

favour as when he sits down to Virgil or Homer, he will find incidents and sentiments therein, expressed with more natural propriety and energy than can be found in their writings, though in every age since they wrote they have been the objects of universal admiration.

I am loth to dismiss the subject we are upon, without giving you an abstract of this author's critique upon the several writers of the New Testament.*

St. Matthew, saith he, hath all the characters of a good historian; truth and impartiality, clearness of narration, propriety and gravity of diction, and order of time well observed. The two next evangelists often borrow his very words and form of expression, when they are on the same subject, and yet each has his proper style.

St. Mark has a comprehensive, clear, and beautiful brevity. He sometimes uses the repetition of words of the same original and like sound, as the most vigorous authors do: such as *απεστεγασαν την στεγην*, Mark ii. 4; *εν τη αναστασει ὁταν αναστωσι*, chap. xii. 23; *κτισεως, ης εκτισεν*, chap. xiii. 19.

St. Luke's style is pure, copious, and flowing. He acquaints us with numerous historical passages, not related by the other evangelists. He is justly applauded for his politeness and elegance by some critics, who seem, however, to magnify him in order to depreciate his brethren, notwithstanding he hath as many Hebraisms and peculiarities as any of them.

The style of St. John is grave and simple, short and conspicuous, always plain, and sometimes low; but he reacheth to the heavens in the sublimity of his notions. He has frequent repetitions, in order to press his important doctrines with more closeness and vehemence. He often takes one thing two ways, both in the affirmative and negative: as, "He that hath the Son hath life; but he that hath not the Son, hath not life."

St. Paul is admired for the copiousness and variety of his style, for the loftiness of his sentiment, for the dexterity of his address. He has every charm of eloquence, and shows himself, occasionally, master of every style. "If any," saith

* See vol. i. part. ii. chap. vii.

Mr. Locke, "hath thought St. Paul a loose writer, it was only because he was a loose reader; for he that takes notice of his design, will find there is scarce a word or expression he makes use of, except with relation and tendency to his present main purpose."

Erasmus passes a bold censure upon St. James, when he saith, "The epistle under his name does not everywhere express the apostolical gravity and majesty."* But other learned and judicious persons have imagined they have discovered in that epistle, vigorous and expressive words, a beautiful simplicity, natural and engaging sentiments, lively figures, and substantial eloquence. Where can a finer description of the malignity and mischief of an unbridled tongue be found, than in his third chapter? The emphasis and eloquence of that sublime description of the divine munificence and immutabilty, in the seventeenth verse of the first chapter, is greatly and justly admired.†

St. Peter's style expresses the noble vehemence and fervour of his spirit. He writes with that quickness and rapidity, sometimes neglecting the formal niceties of grammar (as is common with sublime geniuses), that you can scarcely perceive the pauses of his discourse, and the distinction of his periods. His description of the conflagration and future judgment, 2 Pet. iii., is a master-piece. He makes us see, as it were, the heavens and the earth wrapt up in devouring flames, and hear the groans of an expiring world, and the crush of nature tumbling into universal ruin. And how solemn and moving is the epiphonema, or practical inference, "Seeing, therefore, all these things must be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness;" ver. 11.

Origen saith, that "Jude hath wrote an epistle, of few

* Vid. Annot. in cap. v. sub fine.

† The first words of that passage are a fine hexameter,

Πασα δοσις αγαθη, και παν δωρημα τελειον.

A small transposition of the next words, will make another hexameter,

Εστ' απο των φωτων πατρος καταβαινον ανωθεν.

How naturally do sublime sentiments give birth to poetical numbers, as well as poetical expressions!

verses, indeed, but full of vigorous expressions of heavenly grace."* This apostle adopts the sentiment, and frequently the words of St. Peter, in the second chapter of his second epistle, though sometimes he leaves out some of his words, at other times he enlarges, and gives a different turn to the thought. These two writers are very near akin, in subject, style, vehemence, and just indignation against impudence, lewdness, and debauchers of sound principles. They answer one another in the New Testament, as the prophecy of Obadiah and part of the forty-ninth of Jeremiah do in the Old.

After Mr. Blackwall hath fully vindicated the writers of the New Testament, and set them, at least, upon a level with the best classics, he shows, in the last chapter, what advantages they have over them in various respects. The greater part of the second volume is a critique upon the versions and various lections of the New Testament, which it is beside our present purpose to consider.

We return, now, from this digression, to the subject of Jewish Antiquities.

The Genealogies of the Hebrews.

Godwin observes, that "the whole body of Israel, or the Hebrew nation, was divided into twelve tribes, and that public records were kept, wherein every one's genealogy was registered, to manifest to what particular tribe he belonged." This appears from the following passage in Chronicles: "The acts of Rehoboam—are they not written in the book of Shemaiah the prophet, and of Iddo the seer, concerning genealogies?" 2 Chron. xiii. 15: להתיחש *lehithjaches, in genealogizando,* that is, probably, in their genealogical tables of the royal families of the house of David; in which, also, it seems was interspersed some account of the lives and actions of the kings; the acts of Rehoboam being not only written in this book, but likewise the "acts of his son Abijah, his ways and his sayings;" 2 Chron. xiii. 22. In the fifth chapter of the First Book of Chronicles, after an abstract of the genealogies

* Comment. in Matt. xii. 55, p. 223, D. edit. Huet. Colon. 1685.

contained in the book of Genesis, and of some of the tribes of Israel to the time of the captivity, it is added, "All these were reckoned by genealogies in the days of Jotham king of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam king of Israel," ver. 17; that is, the genealogical tables were then drawn up, which afterwards were continued down to the captivity, the names of several persons being inserted, who did not live till after the days of Jotham and Jeroboam. And then, after a genealogical table of the other tribes in the three next chapters, it follows, "So all Israel were reckoned by genealogies; and behold they were written in the book of the kings of Israel and Judah;" chap. ix. 1. Where, by "the book of the kings," cannot be meant those two historical books, which now pass under that name, these genealogies not being written therein, but some authentic public record of their genealogies, called "the King's Book," probably as being under his custody; of which it is not unlikely there was a duplicate, one copy kept by the king of Judah, the other by the king of Israel, for it is called "the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah."

The story of Herod's destroying the records of the genealogies, which Godwin mentions, is related by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History.* Yet it does not seem that the Jews lost all account of their genealogies from that time, for they continued their distinction of tribes long after. St. Paul says he was of the "tribe of Benjamin;" Phil. iii. 5. St. James writes to the "twelve tribes that were scattered abroad;" James i. 1. And, later still, Josephus gives the genealogy of his own family in his Life, and says, "I give you this succession of our family, as I find it written in the public tables."† And he adds, that "all their priests were obliged to prove their succession from an ancient line;" and if they could not do it, they were to be excluded from officiating as priests. From whence it appears, there were public genealogical tables of their tribes and families as late as Josephus, who lived at the destruction of Jerusalem. By the way, therefore, it may be reasonably presumed, that both St. Matthew and St. Luke copied their genealogies of Christ, the one of the line of Mary, the other of Joseph, out of the public records which were

* Lib. i. cap. vii. p. 24, edit. Reading, Cantab. 1720.

† Joseph. in vitâ, sect. i. ad fin. apud Oper. tom. ii. p. 1, edit. Haverc.

deemed authentic vouchers. The apostle, accordingly, represents it as a thing evident to the Jews, that "our Lord sprung out of Judah;" Heb. vi. 14. It was so by their own genealogical tables, which the sacred historians faithfully copied. If there were any errors in those tables, they were not accountable for them, their business was only to transcribe without alteration; tampering with them might have created suspicion, and given the Jews some colour for denying that our Lord "sprung out of Judah," according to the ancient prophecies concerning the Messiah.

Upon the whole, we must either conclude, that Eusebius had been entirely misinformed concerning Herod's burning the genealogical records, or that if one copy (perhaps that which was laid up in the archives of the temple) was destroyed, there were others in private hands, from whence another public copy was afterwards transcribed, and deposited in the same place.

It is probable, that after the dispersion of the Jews, upon the dissolution of their polity, the genealogical tables came to be neglected, and so gradually perished. Some imagine, that their frequent intermarriages with the people of the countries into which they were dispersed, made them designedly discontinue them; that the corrupt mixture and debasement of their blood might not appear. However that be, it is certain they have long since been lost.

From hence an argument is formed by Christians, that the Messiah must be already come; since, if he be not, it can never be proved, that he is of the tribe of Judah and family of David.

But to this the Jews reply, that either Elias, or some other inspired priest or prophet, shall come, and restore their genealogical tables before the Messiah's appearance;—a tradition, which they ground on a passage in Nehemiah, chap. vii. 64, 65, to this effect: The genealogical register of the families of certain priests being lost, they were not able to make out their lineal descent from Aaron; and therefore, "as polluted, were put from the priesthood;" the "Tirshatha said unto them, that they should not eat of the most holy things, till there stood up a priest with Urim and Thummim." From hence the Jews conclude, that such a priest will stand

up, and restore and complete the genealogies of their families: though others suppose these words to import, that they should never exercise their priesthood any more; and that, "till there shall stand up a priest with Urim and Thummim," amounts to the same as the Roman proverb, *ad Græcas calendas*, since the Urim and Thummim were now absolutely and for ever lost.

The Proselytes.

We now come to the proselytes; who were not of the natural posterity of Abraham, but joined themselves to the people of Israel, and were, by the Greeks, styled Προσελυτοι, απο του προσεληλυθεναι, *ab adventando et coeundo*;* but by the Hebrews, גרים *gèrim, peregrini*, foreigners or inmates, in opposition to natives. Hence the son of a proselyte, by the father's side, was called בן גר *ben ger;* the son of a proselyte by the mother's side, בן גרה *ben gerah;* and the son of both a he and she proselyte, by the artificial name בגבג *bagbag*, which is composed of the initial letters of *ben ger*, and *ben gerah*.

The Hebrews speak of two sorts of proselytes, the one called גרי צדק *gere tsedhek, proselyti justitiæ;* the other תושבים *toshabhim, inquilini, or* גרי שער *gere shangnar, proselyti portæ*. The former became complete Jews, and were in all respect united to the Jewish church and nation; the latter did not embrace the Jewish religion, yet were suffered to live among the Jews under certain restrictions. Nevertheless the former, as well as the latter, are sometimes distinguished from Jews, that is, from native Jews. Thus in the Acts, chap. xiii. 43, we read of the Jews, and religious proselytes, at Antioch in Pisidia; who must have been proselytes of righteousness, because none were called proselytes of the gate (if any such there were), who did not dwell in the land of Israel.

As for the proselytes of righteousness, the Scripture gives us no other account of the manner of their admission into the Jewish church, but by the rite of circumcision. In the book of Exodus, amongst the regulations concerning the passover,

* Philo. Jud. lib. i.; de Monarch. apud Opera, p. 631, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

this is one, "When a stranger will sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the land;" chap. xii. 48. Where these two things are farther observable:

1st. That when a man thus became a proselyte, all his males were to be circumcised as well as himself; whereby his children were admitted into the visible church of God, in his right, as their father.

2dly. That upon this he should be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of the Jewish church and nation, as well as be subject to the whole law: he should be as one "born in the land."

To this brief account which the Scripture gives us of the admission of proselytes, the rabbies add a much larger one, of the preparation for their admission, of the form of their admission, and of the consequences and effects of it.

First, The preparation for the admission of proselytes consisted, according to them, of three articles:

1st. An examination:

2dly. Instruction:

3dly. Their making a profession of their faith, and of their obedience to the Jewish law.

1st. The person that offered himself to be a proselyte, was examined by three of the magistrates concerning the causes that moved him to it; whether it was the love of any Jewish woman, the fear of any temporal punishment, the prospect of riches, or of any worldly advantage; or whether it was a sincere love to God and his law? When he had given a satisfactory answer to these questions, he was then,

2dly. Instructed in the Jewish religion, and particularly in the doctrine of rewards and punishments. And after this,

3dly. He solemnly professed his assent to the doctrines which had been proposed to him, and promised to persevere in the faith and practice of the law of God till death.

Secondly, As to the form and manner of admitting proselytes, the rabbies make it to consist of three articles,—circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice.

1st. To the Scripture account of the requirement of circumcision, in this case, they add, that though the proselyte was

a Samaritan, or of any other nation who used that rite, some blood must, nevertheless, be drawn afresh from the part which had been circumcised.

2dly. The proselyte, whether male or female, must be baptized by the immersion of the whole body into water; and this must be performed in a river, fountain, or pond, not in a vessel.

Some ground this proselyte baptism on the instruction which Jacob gave to his "household, and all that were with him," when they were to make a new consecration of themselves to God,—"Put away the strange gods from amongst you, and be clean," Gen. xxxv. 2; where, by "being clean," they understand their being baptized, or their bodies being washed with water. They farther suppose, that the Israelites "being baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," mentioned by St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 2, means their entering into the Mosaic covenant by the rite of baptism; and that when, therefore, in after ages, any became proselytes, or entered into this covenant, they also were baptized.

Godwin seems to think John's baptism was of this sort. But, it is certain, that could not properly be proselyte baptism; because he administered it to such as were Jews already, and he had no commission to set up a new dispensation, to which people should be admitted by this or any other rite. He only gave notice, that the kingdom of God, or the gospel dispensation, was at hand; but it did not commence till after his death, namely, at our Saviour's resurrection: and proselyte baptism was a form of professing a new religion, at least new to the person professing it, and of his being admitted a member of a church of which he was not one before. It was, therefore, I say, of a very different nature from John's baptism. His is rather to be considered as one of those "divers washings," in use among the Jews on many occasions; for he did not attempt to make any alteration in the Jewish religion as settled by the Mosaic law, any more than to erect a new dispensation. And as these washings were intended, not only for "the purifying of the flesh," but to be signs and symbols of moral purity; so the rite of baptism was, in this view, very suitable to the doctrine of repentance, which John preached.

It is a farther supposition of Godwin's, that our Saviour converted this Jewish proselyte baptism into a Christian sacrament. Upon this notion Dr. Wall* hath founded an argument for baptizing children as well as adult persons; because, when a parent was proselyted, all his children were baptized, as well as all his male children circumcised. But as baptism was administered, according to the Jewish doctors, only to the children born before his proselytism, not to any born afterwards, nor to his more distant posterity, who were esteemed holy branches, in virtue of springing from an holy root;† some infer, that under the Christian dispensation baptism is only to be administered to converts from Judaism, Mahometanism, Paganism, or some other religion, and to their descendants born before their conversion and baptism, but to none born after. Mr. Emlyn, in particular,‡ insists upon this argument against the constant and universal obligation of infant baptism.

But, after all, it remains to be proved, not only that Christian baptism was instituted in the room of proselyte baptism, but that the Jews had any such baptism in our Saviour's time. The earliest accounts we have of it are in the Mishna and Gemara;§ the former compiled, as the Jews assert, by Rabbi Juda, in the second century, though learned men in general bring it several centuries lower; the latter, not till the seventh century. There is not a word of it in Philo; nor yet in Josephus, though he gives an account of the pro-

* See the Introduction to his History of Infant Baptism.

† It was a maxim with the rabbies, "Natus baptizati habetur pro baptizato." This restriction of baptism to children born before their parents' proselytism, rests on the same authority as the custom of baptizing any children of proselytes, which appears from Dr. Wall.

‡ Previous Question to several Questions about valid and invalid Baptism.

§ The Mishna is a collection of the Jewish traditions and explanations of several passages of Scripture. The Gemara is a sort of glossary on the Mishna; and these together make up the Talmud. There are two Gemaras, that of Jerusalem and that of Babylon, the latter of which is most valued. The Jerusalem Gemara, Father Morin proves from the work itself, in which mention is made of the Turks, could not have been wrote till the time of Heraclius, about the year 620. The Gemara of Babylon was begun by one Asa, in the beginning of the seventh century, and on account of the wars between the Saracens and Persians, discontinued for seventy-three years, and then finished by one Josa.

selyting of the Idumeans by Hyrcanus. Indeed, on this occasion, he mentions only circumcision as the rite of initiation, and saith, that upon receiving this rite, and living according to the Jewish law, they from that time became Jews.* And notwithstanding he speaks of John's baptism, yet it is under a very different notion from the proselyte baptism spoken of by the mishnical rabbies. "This good man," saith he, "did Herod kill, who exhorted the virtuous, just, and pious, to come to his baptism; for he looked upon baptism to be acceptable to God, when used, not for purging away certain offences, but for purifying the body, the soul having been before cleansed by righteousness."† So that he makes John's baptism to be of the nature of the Jewish purifications, or ceremonial washings, without having any reference to proselyte baptism; which, on this occasion, he could hardly have failed mentioning, if it had been then in use.

It is alleged, however, in favour of its antiquity, that it is mentioned by Arrian, who lived A. D. 150; for, speaking of a philosopher's obligation to act agreeably to his character, he hath this illustration: "If we see any one change his profession," or become a Jew, "we do not for that reason style him a Jew, but regard him as an hypocrite. Yet when he discovers the disposition and manners of one who is baptized, του βεβαμμενου, and enlisted in that sect, then he both is, and is called, a Jew."‡

But to this it is replied, that nothing was more common than for the heathens to confound the Jews and Christians. Even Festus, who governed for some time in Judea, seems to have taken the Christians only for a sect of the Jews; Acts xxv. 19, 20. Suetonius speaks of an insurrection made by the Jews, "impulsore Chresto."§ And it is most likely that Arrian meant Christians in the place alleged, because in his time many persons became proselytes to Christianity, but few or none to Judaism, the Jews, who were scattered amongst all nations, being every where oppressed and despised. Be-

* Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. ix. sect. i. tom. i. p. 659, edit. Haverc.

† Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. v. sect. ii. tom. i. p. 883, 884, edit. Haverc.

‡ Comment. in Epictet. lib. ii. cap. ix. p. 192, edit. Cantab. 1655.

§ Sueton. in vit. Claudii, cap. xxv. sect. xii.; et Annot. in loc. tom. ii. p. 87, edit. Pitisci.

sides, if he had spoken of proselytes to Judaism, it is highly probable he would have mentioned their circumcision, for which the heathens derided them, rather than their baptism, which was not so very foreign to some of the heathen rites of purification.

Upon the whole, it is more likely the Jews took the hint of proselyte baptism from the Christians, after our Saviour's time, than that he borrowed his baptism from theirs; which, whenever it came into practice, was one of those additions to the law of God, which he severely censures; Matt. xv. 9. To this it is probable Justin Martyr refers, in his dialogue with Trypho, when, among the Jewish heresies or sects, he mentions that of the βαπτισται, baptizers.* From hence it should seem, that in his time, about the middle of the second century, proselyte baptism was a novel practice, and had not yet universally prevailed.

However that be, there wants more evidence of its being as ancient as our Saviour's time than I apprehend can be produced, to ground any argument upon it in relation to Christian baptism. We, therefore, dismiss this form of the admission of proselytes as uncertain.†

3dly. The rabbies tell us, the proselyte was to offer a sacrifice on occasion of his admission, in the presence of three witnesses, not mean, but respectable and honourable persons.

Thus much concerning the form and manner of admitting proselytes.

Thirdly. We are to consider the effects and consequences of being made a proselyte.

1st. The proselyte was now considered as born again. It was a saying among the Jews, that "when a man is made a proselyte, he is like a new-born infant," and "he hath a new soul." This is supposed to throw some light on our Saviour's reproof to Nicodemus, "Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things?" John iii. 10; that is, what being "born again" means? For, it seems, Nicodemus, apprehending a Jew was never to be a proselyte to any other religion,

* Apud Opera, p. 307, A. edit. Paris, 1615.

† On the subject of proselyte baptism, see Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. ad Matt. iii. 6, and Harm. ad Joh. iii. 23. Selden, de Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. ii. cap. ii.; particularly Wall's Introduction to his History of Infant Baptism, and Gale's Reflections on Wall, lett. ix. x.

did not know how to understand it otherwise than of "entering a second time into the womb, and being born," ver. 4. Whereas he, who was a master in Israel, and probably a member of the great council or Sanhedrim, might have been expected to comprehend the force of our Lord's phraseology from the common use of the like expressions concerning those who became proselytes.*

2dly. The bond of natural relation, betwixt the proselyte and all his kindred, was now dissolved. Wherefore it was a maxim with the rabbies, that a proselyte might lawfully marry his own mother, or his own daughter, born before he became a proselyte, they being now no more related to him than any other women: though such marriages were looked upon as indecent, and on that account not permitted.† Some have supposed our Saviour refers to the proselyte's renunciation of his natural relations when he saith, "If any man come unto me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple;" Luke xiv. 26. And that the same is alluded to in the following passage of the Psalmist: "Hearken, O daughter, and incline thine ear; forget also thine own people and thy father's house;" Psalm xlv. 10. Tacitus, in his character of the Jews, having mentioned their custom of circumcision, as adopted by proselytes, adds, "They then quickly learn to despise the gods, to renounce their country, and to hold their parents, children, and brethren, in the utmost contempt."‡ And very probably this unnatural contempt, which the Jewish doctors taught proselytes to entertain of their nearest relations, might be one thing on account of which they are said to have "made them twofold more the children of hell than themselves;" Matt. xxiii. 15.

3dly. The proselyte was now to all intents and purposes a Jew,§ and entitled to a share in the privileges and blessings

* See Lightfoot, Horæ Heb. in loc.

† Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. ad Joh. iii. 3, and Selden, de Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. v. cap. xviii.

‡ Tacit. Histor. lib. v. cap. v.

§ Consult Numb. xv. 15, Esth. viii. 17, and Josephus, in the place above cited concerning the Idumeans, where he saith, that being circumcised and living according to the law of Moses, they were from that time Jews, το λοιπον Ιουδαιον.

of such. He was to be treated with the utmost respect and kindness:* no native Jew might upbraid him with his former idolatry and wickedness. Yet it is certain the Jews were in general apt to look with a very evil eye upon proselytes, especially on those who had been Samaritans; for they thought themselves allowed to hate Samaritans, even though they became proselytes, because their ancestors obstructed the rebuilding the temple and the holy city; and for this they would never forgive them, though by admitting them as proselytes they declared their faith and hope that God had forgiven them.

According to the rabbies, proselytes were excluded from many civil advantages, or privileges of the commonwealth, to which Israelites by descent were entitled.† Certain it is, the law made a difference between one nation and another, as to what is called "entering into the congregation of the Lord;" Deut. xxiii, beginning. Edomites and Egyptians had this privilege in the third generation, ver. 7, 8; though their immediate children were excluded, their grandchildren were admitted. An Ammonite or Moabite was excluded even "to the tenth generation," saith the law, or, as it is added, "for ever;" which the Jews take to be explanatory of the tenth generation, ver. 3. The law was certainly thus understood in Nehemiah's time: "On that day they read in the book of Moses in the audience of the people; and therein was found written, that the Ammonite and the Moabite should not enter into the congregation of God for ever, &c.; and it came to pass, when they had heard the law, that they separated from Israel all the mixed multitude;" Nehem. xiii. 1—3. Bastards were, likewise, under the same exclusion to the tenth generation, though not for ever; Deut. xxiii. 2.

It is not certain what is meant by not "entering into the congregation of the Lord." It cannot be, as Ainsworth rightly observes,‡ not adopting the faith and religion of Israel, and entering into the church in that respect; because it was law-

* See a remarkable passage in Philo, lib. i. de Monarchia, apud Opera, p. 631, 632, F. G. A. edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

† Vid. Selden, de Jure Naturæ et Gent. lib. ii. cap. iv. Oper. tom. i. p. 194—196; et de Scynedr. lib. ii. cap. viii. tom. ii. p. 1396, et seq. edit. Lond. 1726.

‡ In loc.

ful for all so to do; Exod. xii. 48, 49. The Hebrew doctors generally understand by it, a prohibition of the Israelites marrying with such persons as are here excluded.* To this it is objected, that "he who is wounded *in genitalibus, cui sunt attriti vel amputati testes,* or who is totally castrated, *cui abscissum est veretrum,* is, likewise, excluded," ver. 1. Now, say they, it would be superfluous to forbid women to marry with such persons, because it cannot be supposed they would. It may nevertheless be replied, though such a prohibition might probably be needless, when this their defect was known, it might be requisite to forbid such persons marrying, when it was secret, as they might be inclined to do for several politic reasons. Dr. Patrick, therefore, understands by the mixed multitude, which in the forecited passage of Nehemiah we are told, was separated from Israel by this law, such as were born of strangers, who were not allowed to partake of the rites of marriage with Israelites.

But the opinion concerning entering into the congregation, most commonly received among Christian writers, is, that it signifies being permitted to bear any office in the Jewish commonwealth. And it is certain, saith Dr. Patrick, the Hebrew word קהל *kahal,* which we render congregation, does in many places signify, not the whole body of the people of Israel, but the great assembly of elders. Those who prefer this sense, assign as a reason why eunuchs of all sorts were excluded as well as strangers, that they are generally observed to want courage, and are therefore unfit for government..

We proceed now to the other sort of proselytes, whom the Jewish doctors style גרי שער *gere shangnar,* "strangers of the gate," from an expression which several times occurs in the Mosaic law, "The stranger that is within thy gate," see Deut. xiv. 21. Or otherwise they are called גרי תושב *gere toshabh.* Thus in Leviticus we read of "strangers that sojourned" among the Israelites, התושבים הגרים *hattoshabim haggarim,* Lev. xxv. 45. These were foreigners, who did not embrace the Jewish religion (and are, therefore, improperly called proselytes), yet "were suffered to live among the Jews," under certain restrictions. As,

1st. That they should not practise idolatry, nor worship

* Vid. Selden. de Jure Naturæ et Gent. lib. v. cap. xvi. Opera, tom. i. p. 576.

any other god beside the God of Israel; which, under the Theocracy, was *crimen læsæ majestatis*, and therefore not to be tolerated: "He that sacrificeth unto any god, save the Lord, he shall utterly be destroyed;" Exod. xxii. 20.

2dly. That they should not blaspheme the God of Israel: "He that blasphemeth the name of the Lord shall surely be put to death; as well the stranger as he that is born in the land;" Lev. xxiv. 16. And perhaps also,

3dly. That they should keep the Jewish sabbath; so far at least as to refrain from working on that day. For in the fourth commandment the obligation of observing the sabbatical rest is expressly extended to the "stranger that was within their gates;" Exod. xx. 10.

So long as they lived under these restrictions in a peaceable manner, the Israelites were forbid to "vex or oppress them;" Exod. xxii. 21. Nevertheless they might buy slaves out of their families, as well as of the heathen that were round about them; Lev. xxv. 44, 45. But of their brethren, the Israelites, they were forbid to make slaves, ver. 39, 40. It was lawful to lend upon usury to these strangers, though it was not to an Israelite; Deut. xxiii. 20. They might eat that which died of itself, which was prohibited to an Israelite; Deut. xiv. 21. By the stranger, therefore, who was forbidden to "eat blood and that which died of itself," Lev. xvii. 12. 15, we must necessarily understand a proselyte of righteousness. And such also, the Jewish doctors say, is the stranger mentioned in the fourth commandment, who was obliged to keep the sabbath; it being, in their apprehension, unlawful for any uncircumcised person to observe the law of Moses, because it was given peculiarly to Israel: "Moses commanded us a law, even the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob;" Deut. xxxiii. 4: in particular the law concerning the sabbath: "Therefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath throughout their generations for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign betwixt me and the children of Israel for ever;" Exod. xxxi. 16, 17. But in concluding from hence, that none except native Israelites, and such as had joined themselves to their church, were obliged by the law of the sabbath, they seem to forget, that it was given to Adam, and consequently to all mankind; Gen. ii. 3. There

is no impropriety, therefore, in supposing, that these uncircumcised strangers were comprehended in the fourth commandment. Besides, it seems reasonable, that they should be obliged to rest on the Jewish sabbath, lest their working or recreations should disturb and hinder the devotion of the Israelites.

These strangers were, moreover, permitted to worship the God of Israel in the outer court of the temple; which for that reason was called "the court of the Gentiles;" to which there is a reference in the charge given to the angel in the book of the Revelation, to measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein; but the court which is without the temple, to leave out, and measure it not; because it is given to the Gentiles; Rev. xi. 2. Betwixt this and the inner court, where the Israelites assembled, there was a wall, to which the apostle Paul alludes; "For he is our peace, who hath made both (Jews and Gentiles) one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us;" Eph. ii. 14. For such worshippers as these strangers, and for their acceptance with God, Solomon prayed at the dedication of the temple: "Moreover, concerning as tranger, that is not of thy people Israel, but cometh out of a far country, for thy name's sake (for they shall hear of thy great name, and of thy strong hand, and of thy stretched-out arm), when he shall come and pray toward this house, hear thou in heaven thy dwelling place, and do according to all that the stranger calleth to thee for; that all the people of the earth may know thy name to fear thee, as do thy people Israel;" 1 Kings viii. 41—43.

The numbers of these strangers, who dwelt among the Israelites, were very considerable; we find no less than one hundred fifty-three thousand six hundred of them, in Solomon's time, employed in servile labour, 2 Chron. ii. 17, 18.

This is the sum of what can be gathered from Scripture concerning the גרי שער *gere shangnar*, or תושב *toshabh*.

But the talmudical rabbies have made proselytes of all these strangers and sojourners,* at least, of all who were in the land of Israel when the Jews were their own masters, and not in subjection to any foreign power; for they confess, in that case, there was no preventing heathens dwelling among

* Vid. Selden. de Jure Naturæ et Gent. lib. ii. cap. iii.

them, even though they refused to submit to the restrictions of the law; they say, therefore, there were no proselytes of the gate in such times: but that at other times no Gentile was permitted to dwell in the land of Israel, without being a proselyte of the gate; that is, without submitting to, and obeying the seven precepts, which the rabbies pretend God gave to Noah and his sons, and which, according to them, comprised the law of nature, common to all mankind.

These have been usually styled the *septem præcepta Noachidarum;** by which they were required to abstain from idolatry, from blasphemy, from murder, from adultery, from theft: to institute judges to maintain the laws; and not to eat the flesh of any animal, cut off while it was alive.

Maimonides saith, the first six precepts were given to Adam, and the seventh to Noah.†

But what creates a suspicion, that this is all invention of the talmudists, is, that there is no mention of these seven precepts being given to the Noachidæ, in Scripture, in Onkelos, in Josephus, or in Philo; and that neither Jerome, nor Origen, nor any of the ancient fathers, appear to have been in the least acquainted with them.

However, something like the seventh was undoubtedly given to Noah and his posterity: "The flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat;" Gen. ix. 4. Under this restriction, they had, presently after the flood, permission to eat all sorts of animal food: "Every moving thing, that liveth, shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things," ver. 3. From whence it has been generally concluded, that the antediluvians used only vegetables; which seems, indeed, to be the only kind of food God allotted for man at his creation; Gen. i. 29, 30. Nevertheless, immediately after the flood, the permission is extended to "every moving thing that liveth;" that is, to all kind of animals that are fit for food, without any such distinction between clean and unclean as was afterward made under the Jewish law.

Some have, indeed, maintained the contrary opinion; sup-

* Vid. Selden. de Jure Naturæ et Gent. lib. i. cap. x.; et Shickard. de Jure Regio, cum Notis Carpzov. p. 333, et seq.

† De Regibus, cap. ix. ab init. apud Crenii Fascicul. nonum. p. 133.

posing, that the use of animal food was included in the general grant of power and dominion which God gave to Adam over the brute creation; Gen. i. 26—28.

The chief arguments to prove that animal food was not used before the deluge are,*

1st. That God's grant of the use of his creatures for food to Adam, is expressly restrained to the vegetable creation.

2dly. The scripture history is wholly silent concerning the use of animal food before the flood.

3dly. If animal food had been then permitted, there could have been no reason for this new grant which God gave to Noah.

The chief arguments, alleged on the other side, are taken,

1st. From the history of Abel's sacrifice; which is said to have consisted of the "firstlings of his flock, and the fat thereof;" Gen. iv. 4. Now, it having never been usual to offer any thing in sacrifice to God, but what was useful to man, it is concluded from this account, that animals were at that time used for food. Nevertheless, this will not follow, because Abel's flock might be kept for the sake of the milk and wool, which render these creatures exceedingly serviceable.

It must be owned, that the particular mention of the fat, in the account of this sacrifice, might incline one to think it was a peace-offering; the fat of which was consumed upon the altar, and the flesh eat by the person at whose charge the offering was made, and by the priests: Lev. iii. per totum; chap. vii. 15. 33. But the affix of the word חלבהן *chelbehen*, which we translate "the fat thereof," should rather be rendered, "of them;" namely, of the firstlings of his flock; intimating, not that he offered the fat of the animal, but the fattest or best amongst them. The word חלב *chelebh* is often used for the best of its kind, whatever be the thing spoken of. Thus חלב חטה *chelebh chittah* is well rendered "the finest of the wheat:" Psalm lxxxi. 16; cxlvii. 14. The fat of the oil and the fat of the wine, mean the best of their kind, as our translators have rendered it; Numb. xviii. 12. The "fat of the land," means the best of its produce; Gen. xlv. 18. Thus it seems most natural to understand the word

* On this debate consult Heidegger. Histor. Patriarch. tom. i. exercit. xv.

חלב *chelebh*, in the present case; importing that Abel brought the best of his flock for an offering to the Lord: this we suppose was a whole burnt-offering, or sacrifice of atonement; which, according to the law afterward given to Moses, was entirely consumed on the altar, except the skin, which was the priest's fee, for killing and offering it; Lev. vii. 8.

There were many other sorts of sacrifices afterward appointed by the law of Moses, which had a political, as well as religious use, as we showed in a former lecture. But the design of the whole burnt-offering was entirely religious, to impress the conscience with a sense of the deserved punishment of sin, and to typify the great atonement which Christ, in due time, was to offer. There was the same reason, therefore, for these sacrifices before the time of Moses, as there was afterwards; and it is probable, that they were instituted presently after the fall, and that of the skins of the animals slain for sacrifice, God made those garments for Adam and Eve, which are spoken of in the third chapter of Genesis, ver. 21; that is, directed them to make them; as Jacob is said to have made his son Joseph a coat of many colours, Gen. xxxvii. 3, or ordered it to be made.

Upon the whole, the history of Abel's sacrifice affords no proof of men's eating animal food before the flood. We proceed, therefore,

2dly. To another argument in favour of this opinion, built upon the distinction of the creatures into clean and unclean, before Noah entered into the ark; Gen. vii. 2. Now it is alleged, that we cannot conceive of any cleanness or uncleanness in those animals themselves; but merely as some are more fit for food than others, or as God is pleased to permit the use of some, and not of others; and therefore it is said, this distinction of them before the flood must imply, that animal food was used at that time.

To this it has been replied by some, that the distinction is used by Moses, in his history of those early times, proleptically. Cyrenius is called governor of Syria by St. Luke, in relating what he did at the time of our Saviour's birth, though he was not made governor of Syria till several years after. So, we may suppose Moses, in his history of the deluge, ranges the animals that went into the ark, into clean and

unclean, according to the distinction afterward made betwixt them by the law, and well known when he wrote. This answer, perhaps, hath too much the air of a subterfuge to be perfectly satisfactory.

Suppose then we make this reply, that the terms "clean and unclean" do not here respect the distinction afterward made by the Jewish law; but a natural difference, which may be observed in most of the creatures that God allowed or forbid to be eat by the Jews. The clean have no upper cutting teeth, their fat hardens into suet, they rise up with their hind feet first; in all which respects they are the reverse of the unclean. Such a distinction, therefore, men would naturally make, not only when animal food came to be used, but probably before.

However, suppose it should respect the use of them for food, it will not follow, because God commanded above three times as many more of the clean creatures, than of the unclean, to be preserved in the ark, that men used them for food before the flood. It seems more probable, that this distinction was now first made, and a greater number of those which were most fit for food preserved, merely because God intended to permit the use of them in a very short time.

There is another question on this head, which should be a little considered before we dismiss the subject: For what reason were the antediluvians not allowed to make use of animal food, as well as Noah and his posterity after the flood?

The more commonly received opinion is, that it was to preserve their lives, that the world might be speedily replenished with inhabitants; because the free use of flesh would impair their constitution, and shorten their days. Their longevity is accordingly imputed to their sobriety, and the simplicity of their diet, and in particular to their living only on vegetables. But this would make God's grant of animal food to Noah a curse instead of a blessing. Besides, it is not certain, that the moderate use of it is at all prejudicial to health. If it were, why hath God formed us with teeth so peculiarly adapted to the mastication of it, and with a stomach suited to digest it? Beverovicius, a learned physician,* is so far from being convinced, that eating flesh is unsalutary, and tends to

* Vid. ejus Thesaurum Sanitatis. lib. iii. et apud Heidegger. Histor. Patriarch. tom. i. exer. xiv. de eorum long. sect. xx.

shorten men's lives, that, among several causes of the longevity of the antediluvians, one, which he assigns, is their eating raw flesh; the best and most nourishing parts of which he supposes to be carried off in dressing by the action of the fire. But though there is great reason to conclude the antediluvians eat no flesh, I can see no good reason to impute their longevity to abstaining from it, or to believe, that it was for the sake of their health God did not allow them to use it.

I shall take the liberty myself to offer a conjecture. Supposing the lives of animals were no longer before the flood, and consequently their increase no greater than at present, while the lives of men were ten times as long, and their increase consequently ten times greater; there was then an evident reason why animal food was not permitted, from the insufficient number of animals; insomuch that the use of them would, probably, in a few years have destroyed the whole species. For now men's lives are shortened, and their increase ten times less, there is only such a proportion betwixt the human and brutal species, as ordinarily prevents the want of animal food, without overstocking us. Divine wisdom, therefore, did not make this grant till it thought fit to contract the life of man; which was immediately after the deluge.

Godwin, who relies on the authority of the talmudical rabbies for his account of the proselytes of the gate, produces out of the Scripture history four instances of such proselytes: Naaman the Syrian, 2 Kings v.; Cornelius the Roman centurion, Acts x.; the Ethiopian eunuch, Acts viii. 27; and those devout men, *ανδρες ευλαβεις*, "out of every nation under heaven," who are said to be dwelling at Jerusalem, Acts ii. 5. But none of these are sufficient to support the rabbinical account of such proselytes.

1st. As for Naaman, who was by birth a Syrian, and general of king Benhadad's army, he appears to have been a Gentile idolater. But being miraculously cured of his leprosy by the power of the God of Israel, and the direction of his prophet Elisha, he renounced his idolatry, acknowledged this God to be the only true God, 2 Kings v. 15,—"Behold, now I know, that there is no God in all the earth, but in Israel,"—and promised, for the time to come, that he would worship none other but Jehovah; ver. 17. He also requested the prophet, that he might have two mules' load of earth to carry home with him

from the land of Israel, most probably intending to build an altar with it in his own country; as seems indeed to be implied in the reason with which he enforces his request—"Shall there not, I pray thee, be given to thy servant two mules' burden of earth: for thy servant will henceforth offer neither burnt-offering nor sacrifice to other gods, but unto Jehovah," *ubi supra*. This request seems to have been partly founded on a superstitious opinion he had conceived of some peculiar holiness and virtue in the earth of the country; so that he supposed an altar built of it would be more pleasing, and render his sacrifice more acceptable, to God, than if it were made of any other materials. Perhaps he had formed this notion upon finding such a miraculous virtue in the water of Jordan, that barely washing in it had effected his cure; and he concluded, therefore, the earth must have likewise some extraordinary virtue. Yet he did not conceive this was owing to any thing peculiar in the nature of that water and that earth; but that God had miraculously infused into them this virtue; and he thought it, therefore, best to worship him at an altar of that earth which he had peculiarly sanctified.

Or, it may be, by this symbol of an altar built of the earth of the land of Israel, he meant to signify his communion with that people in the worship of the true God.

He further desired this earth might be given him by the prophet, probably supposing his consent and his blessing upon it would render it more efficacious for the acceptableness of his sacrifice, than if he had taken it without his permission.

He further says, "In this the Lord pardon thy servant, that when my master goes into the house of Rimmon, to worship there, and he leaneth upon my hand, and I bow myself in the house of Rimmon; when I bow down in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing," ver. 18: which some understand to be a reserve, denoting he would renounce idolatry no farther than was consistent with his worldly interest, with his prince's favour, and his place at court. But if so, the prophet would hardly have dismissed him with a blessing, saying, "Go in peace;" ver. 19.

Others therefore suppose, that in these words he begs pardon for what he had done in times past, not for what he should continue to do.

They observe, that השתחויתי *hishtachvethi*, though rendered in the future tense by the Targum, and by all the ancient versions, is really the preterperfect; and they, therefore, understand it, "when I have bowed myself," or "because I have bowed myself" in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant. With this sense Dr. Lightfoot agrees,* and it is defended by the learned Bochart in a large dissertation on the case of Naaman. Yet to me it does not seem very probable, that, if he meant this for a penitential acknowledgment of his former idolatry, he should only mention what he had done as the king's servant, and not his own voluntary worshipping the idol.

The more probable opinion, therefore, is, that he consulted the prophet, whether it was lawful for him, having renounced idolatry and publicly professed the worship of the true God, still, in virtue of his office, to attend his master in the temple of Rimmon, in order that he might lean upon him, either out of state, or perhaps out of bodily weakness; because if he attended him, as he had formerly done, he could not avoid bowing down, when he did. To this the prophet returns no direct answer; lest, if on the one hand he had declared it unlawful, he should have too much discouraged this new convert, before he was well established in the true religion; or if, on the other, he had declared it lawful, he should seem to give countenance to idolatry. He, therefore, made no other reply, but "Go in peace."

After this we have no further mention of Naaman. But in the following account of the wars betwixt Syria and Israel, Benhadad seems to have commanded his army in person: from whence Mr. Bedford† infers, that Naaman was dismissed from the command, for refusing to worship Rimmon. But the premises are not sufficient to support the conclusion; for it appears that Benhadad had commanded his army in person twice before; once in the siege of Samaria, 1 Kings xx. 1, and once at Aphek, ver. 26. Yet from the total silence concerning Naaman it is probably enough conjectured, that he either died, or resigned, or was dismissed, soon after his return.

* Vid. Hor. Hebr. in Luke iv. 27.

† See his Scripture Chronology, p. 627, edit. Lond. 1730.

Well! but though Naaman renounced idolatry, and became a worshipper of the true God; yet he could not be a proselyte of the gate, according to the account the talmudists give of these proselytes, because he did not dwell in the land of Israel, but returned into Syria. If, therefore, he became a proselyte at all, it must have been a proselyte of the covenant; though, perhaps, when he lived in another country, there was no need, in order to his being an acceptable worshipper of the true God, for his submitting to the whole Jewish law. We are rather, therefore, to account him a pious Gentile, than a Jewish proselyte.

Tradition reports, that Gehazi, the prophet's servant, being struck with the leprosy, moved Naaman to erect a hospital for such unhappy persons at Damascus. Thevenot tells us, that there is such a hospital, richly endowed, just by the walls of that city, which owns Naaman for its founder.*

It may not be amiss to observe from Dr. Patrick, that Naaman's was the only miraculous cure of the leprosy, recorded in the Scripture history, till Christ the great prophet came into the world. And how beneficent a miracle it was, we may conclude from the account which Maundrell gives of that disease in those parts of the world.† He says, it differs much from that which is found amongst us; it defiles the whole surface of the body with a foul scurf, deforms the joints, particularly at the wrists and ancles, which swell with a gouty scrofulous substance, very loathsome to look on. The legs of those that are affected with this distemper, look like an old battered horse's; in short, it may pass for the utmost corruption of the human body on this side the grave.

The next Scripture instance of proselytes of the gate, mentioned by Godwin, is Cornelius, the Roman centurion; whose character is, that he was "a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, who gave alms to the people, and prayed to God always;" Acts x. 2. Yet it is evident, he was in no sense a Jewish proselyte, because, in the account of the Jews themselves, he was an unclean person, such a one as it was not lawful for them to keep company with. Nor would

* See his Travels to the Levant, part ii. book i. chap. iv.

† See his second Letter to Mr. Osborn, at the end of his Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 150, 151, edit. 7. Oxford, 1749.

Peter have gone into his house, if he had not been instructed so to do by a special revelation; which appears from the manner of his justifying this visit to Cornelius, so contrary to the received maxims of the Jews: "Ye know," saith he, "that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company with, or come unto one of another nation; but God has showed me that I should not call any man common, or unclean; therefore came I unto you without gainsaying, as soon as I was sent for;" Acts x. 28, 29. The Jewish Christians at Jerusalem, likewise, blamed Peter for this visit: "Thou wentest," say they, "to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them," chap. xi. 3; which shows, that they did not look upon him at all as a proselyte, for with such they might lawfully converse and eat. However, he was, indeed, of the character St. Peter mentions, one "who feared God, and wrought righteousness, and was accepted of him," chap. x. 35; notwithstanding, he was no way related to the Jews, except in the worship of the one true God.

We may observe farther, that Cornelius could not be a proselyte of the gate, according to the talmudists' account, because the Jewish nation was at that time under the Roman yoke; and in these circumstances, according to them, there could be no such proselytes. That he was not a proselyte of the covenant is plain, because he and his family and friends were the first fruits of the Gentiles. He was, therefore, in no sense a Jew, or a proselyte.

As for the Ethiopian eunuch, whom Philip converted to the faith of Christ, and baptized, Acts viii. 26, et seq., he also is improperly reckoned among the proselytes of the gate, for the same reason that Naaman is, because he did not live in the land of Judea; and for the same reason that Cornelius is, because the Jews were not then their own masters, but subject to a foreign power; for at such a time, the rabbies say, there could be no proselytes of the gate.

He seems to have been rather a proselyte of the covenant, or completely a Jew: not only from his reading the Scripture, but because he had taken so long a journey to "worship at Jerusalem," ver. 27, at the feast of Pentecost; one of the three grand festivals, when all the Jewish males, who were able, were, according to the law, to attend the worship of

God at the national altar. He had taken, I say, a very long journey; for his country was doubtless the Ethiopia in Africa, where, about that time, queen Candace reigned; as we learn from Strabo,* and from Dion Cassius,† who informs us that Petronius, the prefect of Egypt, marched an army against Candace into Ethiopia, where he ravaged the country a considerable time, till the deep sands and excessive heats obliged him to return: which event was but about ten or eleven years before the affair here related of the eunuch. And Pliny, speaking of that country, saith, "there reigns Candace," "quod nomen multis jam annis ad reginas transiit."‡

Probably this eunuch, who was treasurer of Ethiopia, had been made a proselyte by those Jews who spread themselves from Alexandria in Egypt into that country. But the present Ethiopians, or Abyssines, who are Christians of the Greek church, maintain that the Jewish religion was universally embraced in their country, from the days of Solomon. It hath been a constant tradition among them, that the queen of Sheba, who went to visit him, was their empress; that she had a son by him, named David; who, as soon as he was of a proper age to undertake such a journey, was sent by her to Jerusalem, to receive his father's blessing, and to be instructed in the law of Moses; that being made thoroughly acquainted with the Jewish religion, he was sent home, with several priests and Levites to assist him in introducing it into Ethiopia; and they were so successful in their mission, that in a few years it was embraced by the whole body of the people, and continued to be the public profession till the promulgation of the gospel in that country.

It is a tradition likewise among them, that the eunuch, baptized by Philip, was steward to their empress, and that, returning home, he converted his mistress and the whole empire to the Christian faith.

Though we cannot depend upon this latter story, yet it must be owned to have a far greater air of probability than the fable of the queen of Sheba and her son, and, indeed, than

* Strabo, xvii. p. 820, edit. Casaub. Paris, 1620.

† Dion. lib. liv. sect. v. tom. i. p. 734, edit. Reimari.

‡ Plin. Histor. Natural. lib. vi. cap. xxix. in fin. vol. i. p. 740, edit. Harduin. Paris, 1685.

most of the traditional stories of the first conversions of countries.*

The last instance which Godwin produces of proselytes of the gate, is, "The devout men, out of every nation under heaven, who dwelt at Jerusalem," and are mentioned in the Acts, chap. ii. 5. But these devout men are expressly said to be Jews; that is, Jews by religion, not by nation; for they belonged to several nations. And though they are afterward distinguished into Jews and proselytes, ver. 10, that doubtless means such as were born of Jewish parents, though in a foreign country, and who had been brought up in their religion; or such as were born of Gentile parents, and had become proselytes to it. Besides, there is the same reason against acknowledging them to be proselytes of the gate, as there is against acknowledging Cornelius and the eunuch to be such; namely, that the Jews were at that time subject to the Roman power.

Upon the whole, there does not appear to be sufficient evidence in the Scripture history of the existence of such proselytes of the gate as the rabbies mention; nor indeed of any who with propriety can be styled proselytes, except such as fully embraced the Jewish religion.†

* Geddes's Church History of Ethiopia, p. 8.

† Concerning the proselytes of the gate, vid. Maimon. de Regibus, cap. viii. sect. x. xi., et cap. ix. x., cum notis Leydecker, apud Crenii Fascicul. nonum, vel Leydeck. de Republ. Hebræor. lib. vi. cap. vii.

Concerning the proselytes of righteousness, vid. Maimon. de Vetito Concubitu, apud Leydecker, de Republicâ Hebræor. lib. vi. cap. vi. p. 364, et seq. Amstel. 1704, et Selden. de Jure Nat. et Gent. cap. ii. supra citat. et cap. iii.

CHAPTER IV.

OF THEIR KINGS.

The alteration made in the form of the Hebrew constitution, which originally was a proper Theocracy, by setting up the regal government, hath been already considered. As it was plainly an act of rebellion against God to make any change in his original settlement, the Jews are therefore charged with "rejecting him, that he should not reign over them, when they desired to have a king to judge them like all the nations;" 1 Sam. viii. 5, 6, 7. Nevertheless, as he permitted divorces, "because of the hardness of their hearts," Matt. xix. 8, in like manner, foreseeing the perverse disposition they would have, after their settlement in Canaan, to such an alteration, he was pleased to give them some rules beforehand, concerning their choice of a king, and the manner of his administration; Deut. xvii. 14, to the end. Some of the rabbies, in order to exculpate their nation from the charge of rebellion on this occasion, would have this permission and regulation amount to an injunction to choose a king. Maimonides tells us,* out of the Babylonish Gemara,† that Moses gave the Israelites three express commandments, to elect a king, to destroy Amalek, and to build a temple, after they were possessed of the land of Canaan. He observes, that they accordingly chose Saul for their king, before they declared war against the Amalekites. But if this had been designed and understood as a command, they would no doubt have chosen a king presently after their settlement in Canaan, and not have delayed it for upwards of three hundred years.‡ We cannot suppose, but

* De Regibus, cap. i. ab init.

† Sanhedrin, cap. xxiii. in excerptis Cocceii, cap. xi. sect. vi.

‡ Si petitio regis absolutè, inquit Abarbanel, fuit legitima, et præceptum legis, et non peccatum fuit, nisi in modo petendi, vel in fine, tempore, aut intentione ejus; quare Joshua et cæteri judices Israelis, ipsum secuti, nun-

Samuel would have put them upon choosing a king in obedience to the law of God, long before they desired one; and not have blamed them, as he did, when they expressed that desire; 1 Sam. x. 19. Many of the rabbies are, therefore, of a contrary opinion;* and so is Josephus, who imputes this desire of a kingly government† to the intolerable corruption which had crept into all the courts of justice through the baseness and avarice of Samuel's two sons.‡ And he introduces his account of the regulations in Deuteronomy concerning their kings, with observing, that they ought not to have effected any other government, but to have loved the present, having the law for their master, and living according to it, for it was sufficient that God was their ruler.§ That their desire of a king was displeasing to God, seems also to be intimated in the prophecy of Hosea, "I gave thee a king in mine anger, and took him away in my wrath;" Hos. xiii. 11: referring to Saul, the first king, on occasion of whose election God expressed his displeasure by terrible thunder; 1 Sam. xii. 17, 18; and to Zedekiah, the last king, whom he suffered, together with his subjects, to be carried captive to Babylon. Maimonides, indeed, pretends that the sin, for which the people were reproved by Samuel, did not consist in their desiring a king, but in their coming to him in a tumultuous and disrespectful manner, and asking a king, not in obedience to the divine command, but because they disdained his government.‖ This, however, is by no means agreeable to the Scripture account, which evidently lays the blame on the desiring a king,¶ not on the manner in which that desire was expressed: "The

quam cogitarunt de rege in Israele constituendo, cum hoc ipsis præceptum esset, quum ingrederentur terram? Quomodo omnes transgressi sunt hoc præceptum, cum essent in terrâ post ejus occupationem et divisionem? Nullum hactenus interpretum vidi, qui de hoc egerit, et ad hoc aliquid responderit. Abarbanel, Dissert. ii. de Statu et Jure Regio, ad calcem Buxtorfii Dissertationum, p. 427, edit. Basil, 1662.

* Vid. Abarbanel, ubi supra, p. 424, et seq.

† Agreeably to 1 Sam. viii. 5.

‡ Antiq. lib. vi. cap. iii. sect. iii. edit. Havere.

§ Lib. iv. cap. viii. sect. xvii.

‖ De Regibus, cap. i. sect. ii.

¶ In regardutione Samuelis, inquit Abarbanel, semper attribuitur peccatum petitioni regis absolutè, &c. Ubi supra, p. 427.

thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Samuel prayed unto the Lord. And the Lord said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people, in all that they say unto thee; for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them;" 1 Sam. viii. 6, 7. The law, therefore, in the seventeenth chapter of Deuteronomy, must be looked upon, not as a command, nor hardly as a permission, to choose a king;* for if they had supposed it to amount even to a permission, no doubt they would have alleged it to Samuel; nor is it easy to see how "their wickedness would then have been so great in asking a king," as it is represented to be. It must be considered, therefore, rather as a restraining law, that in case they would have a king, it should be under such limitations as God then prescribed, which are the eight following:—

1st. That the choice of the person to be their king God would reserve to himself. They must not say, "I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me; but thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose;" Deut. xvii. 14, 15. Accordingly he appointed Saul, by lot, to be their first king, 1 Sam. x. 21; and David, by name, to be their second king; 1 Sam. xvi. 12. He likewise chose Solomon to be David's successor, 1 Chron. xxviii. 5; and, after him, he made the kingly government hereditary in David's family; 1 Kings ii. 4. Nevertheless, this divine choice and appointment only restrained the people from making any other person king than him whom God had nominated; but it did not actually invest him with the regal authority; that was done by an act of the people.† Thus, after God had appointed David to be king, in token of which he had been anointed by Samuel, 1 Sam. xvi. 13; yet the men of Judah anointed him king over the house of Judah, whereby they declared their concurrence, and acceptance of him for their king; 2 Sam. ii. 4. And upon the death of Solomon,

* Abarbanel makes several judicious observations, to show it was no command, in his Dissertation above quoted, p. 436, et seq.

† Per "ponere regem," inquit Abarbanel, intelligitur ejus constitutio per populum; sed electio divina facta fuit per prophetam, mediante unctione. Abarbanel, Dissert. iii. p. 451, ad calcem Buxtorf. Dissert. Philolog. Theolog. edit. Basil, 1662.

though the crown was then hereditary, "all Israel came to Shechem to make his son Rehoboam king;" 1 Kings xii. 1.

2dly. The king must be a native Israelite, not a Heathen, nor a Proselyte. "One from among thy brethren shalt thou set over thee; thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, who is not thy brother;" Deut. xvii. 14, 15. It may naturally be inquired, what occasion was there for this limitation, when God had reserved the choice of the person to himself. I answer, more effectually to unite the people against any foreign invader, and any one who might attempt to seize the crown. The Mishna relates,* that when king Agrippa, an Idumean proselyte, met with this text, as he was reading in public, he burst into tears, because he was not of the seed of Israel. The people, however, encouraged him, crying out, "Fear not, Agrippa, thou art our brother;" probably because the children of Esau, from whom the Idumeans are descended, are called in Deuteronomy the brethren of the Jews; Deut. ii. 4.

3dly. The king was not to multiply horses; and is particularly forbid, therefore, sending to Egypt for them, Deut. xvii. 16, where was the chief breed of those animals in that part of the world. The Egyptian cavalry, which invaded Judea in the reign of Rehoboam, consisted of twelve hundred chariots, and sixty thousand horsemen; 2 Chron. xii. 2, 3. The reason of the king's being prohibited to multiply horses hath been commonly thought to be, to restrain him from affecting unnecessary pomp, expensive to himself, and burdensome to his people. If so, Solomon was egregiously guilty of transgressing this law, who had horses brought out of Egypt, 1 Kings x. 28; and, according to the account in the First Book of Kings, had forty thousand stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen, 1 Kings iv. 26; or, according to the lower account in Chronicles, four thousand stalls for horses and chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen, 2 Chron. ix. 25. Perhaps these two accounts are best reconciled, by allowing ten horses to each stall, mentioned in Chronicles. Or, the word signifying either stable or stall, in Chronicles it may mean the former, in Kings, the latter.†

* Mish. in Sota, sive de uxore adulterii suspecta, cap. vii. sect. viii. edit. Surenhusii, tom. iii. p. 268.

† Stockii Clavis in verb.

Dr. Warburton, in his Divine Legation of Moses, supposes it was the true and sole design of this law to forbid the Jews the use of cavalry in their armies, which, he says, God did on purpose to make it manifest that he protected that nation by a special providence.* If so, Solomon does not seem to have violated this law so grossly as hath been commonly imagined; for though he kept such a multitude of chariots for state, and had twelve thousand horsemen for his life-guard, yet it does not appear that he had any cavalry designed for war.

4thly. The king is forbidden "multiplying wives to himself, that his heart turn not away," Deut. xvii. 17; the most natural exposition of which law is, that it prohibits polygamy, or having more wives than one. For it is not here said, "He shall not greatly multiply," as it is in the next clause concerning silver and gold, but simply, "he shall not multiply." The rabbies, indeed, enlarge the number of wives allowed the king to eighteen, and understand the law as only forbidding his having more,† which they attempt to ground on David's having six wives, a list of whom we have in the Second Book of Samuel, chap. iii. 2—5, compared with what the prophet afterward tells him, that if he had not offended God, he "would moreover have given him such and such things," chap. xii. 8, which they interpret of twice as many wives more, in all eighteen.‡ And, in their opinion, no king should have a greater number than God would have allowed David. Solomon, without doubt, heinously transgressed this law, who had seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines; 1 Kings xi. 3. And the sad effect was, what this law was intended to prevent, that they "turned away his heart from God."

5thly. The king is also forbid "greatly to multiply to himself silver and gold;" Deut. xvii. 17. This Solomon did in a remarkable manner; for it is said, that "the weight of gold

* Sensus est, inquit Abarbanel, regem sibi non debere multiplicare equos ex terra vel sua vel aliorum; neque confidere suæ multitudini et potentiæ, non equis et equitibus numerosis, sed unicam suam fiduciam debere esse Deum. Ubi supra, p. 440.

† Mish. Sanhedrin, cap. ii. sect. iv. tom. iv. p. 217, edit. Surenhus, et Gemar. in excerptis Cocceii, cap. ii. sect. viii.

‡ R. Ob. de Bartenora in Mish. capite supra citato, p. 118.

that came to him in one year was six hundred, threescore, and six talents, besides what he received from the merchantmen, and in particular from the traffic of the spice merchants, and from the kings of Arabia, and from the governors of the country; and that, besides a vast quantity of targets and shields, all of beaten gold, and a throne overlaid with gold, all his drinking vessels, and all the vessels of the house of the forest of Lebanon, were of this precious metal; silver being in Jerusalem, in a manner, as plenty as stones, and little esteemed in his days;" 1 Kings x. 14—27. Notwithstanding no particular reason is given for this prohibition of multiplying silver and gold, we may easily conceive the design of it was, partly to prevent the king's oppressing the people with taxes, in order to enrich himself, as seems to have been done by Rehoboam, whose treasurer the people, therefore, stoned, 1 Kings xii. 18, and partly to restrain him from luxury, the common effect of riches; lest the king's example should debauch and enfeeble the nation, and prove its ruin, as the wealth, and consequent luxury of the Persians, proved the destruction of their empire. The rabbies, indeed, observe, that this law forbids only the king's multiplying gold and silver to himself, or to his own private coffers, but not to the public treasury, or for national exigencies.*

6thly. The king is enjoined to write for himself a copy of the law in a book, out of that which is before the priests and Levites, Deut. xvii. 18; that is, from the authentic copy kept in the sanctuary. Interpreters differ about the meaning of the word משנה *mishne*, which we render a copy. The Seventy translate it το δευτερονομιον, and the Vulgate *deuteronomium*, that translation generally following the version of the Seventy; from whence some have imagined that the king was obliged to transcribe only the book of Deuteronomy.† Montanus renders it *duplum*, which version agrees with Maimonides's interpretation of this law, that "the king was to write the book of the law for himself, besides the book that was left him by his father; and if his father had left him none, or if that were lost, he was to write him two books of the

* Maimon. de Regibus, cap. iii. sect. iv.; Mishn. Sanhedrin, cap. ii. sect. iv.; et Maimon. in loc. tom. iv. p. 218, edit. Surenhus.

† Vid. Abarbanel, Comment. in loc. sive Dissert. ubi supra, p. 441.

law;* the one he was to keep in his archives, the other was not to depart from him, unless when he went to his throne, or to the bath, or to a place where reading would be inconvenient. If he went to war, it accompanied him; if he sat in judgment, it was to be by him."† But the word does not import any more than a single exemplar or copy.‡ Joshua is said to have engraved on the stones, which he erected on Mount Ebal, a copy of the law, משנה *mishne*, a second, of which the autograph was the first.§ The design of the precept was, undoubtedly, to rivet the divine laws more firmly in the memory of the kings, of which, and of their obligations to observe them, they became, through the neglect of this precept, so ignorant in the days of good king Josiah, that he was strangely surprised at what he heard read out of this book of the law,‖ when it was found in the temple, after he had reigned about eighteen years; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 18, et seq.

7thly. The king was bound to govern by law: for it is enjoined him, that he read in this copy of the law all the days of his life, that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them; Deut. xvii. 19. Instead of making his own will his law, as the absolute monarchs of the East generally did, he was to rule according to the law which God had given by Moses. When Samuel, therefore, told the people the manner, משפט

* This was likewise the opinion of many other Jewish doctors. Vid. Carpzov. Annot. ad Schickard. Jus. Reg. p. 82.

† De Regibus, lib. iii. sect. i.

‡ And so the Mishna understands it, Sanhedrin, cap. ii. sect. iv.

§ Vid. Leidecker. Not. ad Maimon. de Regibus, lib. ii. sect. i.

‖ It is the opinion of Abarbanel, that this book was the autograph of Moses, which no doubt was a discovery that would occasion equal pleasure and surprise. To confirm this opinion, Leusden observes that תורה *thorah*, having the He emphatic prefixed in 2 Kings xxii. 11, signifieth that very book of the law which was wrote ביד משה *bejadh Moseh*, by the hand of Moses, as it is expressed in the parallel place in Chronicles, which Dr. Kennicott observes, is a phrase which only occurs there, and naturally means one particular MS., namely, the original. Leusd. Philolog. Hebræo. mixt. Dissert. xxvi. sect. xv. p. 175, edit. 2; Kennicott's Second Dissert. on the Heb. Text, p. 299, 300. See also Leland's Answer to Christianity as Old as the Creation, vol. ii. chap. iv. p. 123—126, Dublin edit. 1733.

mishpat, of the king that should reign over them, 1 Sam. viii. 11, describing a most arbitrary and tyrannical one, who would take their sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, &c., we must not understand him here, as some do, to lay down the rightful authority of the king of Israel, but only the practice of the arbitrary monarchs around them (for they had desired to have a king like the neighbouring nations, ver. 5), in order to divert them from so injudicious and ill-advised a project.* Accordingly, משפט *mishpat* is better rendered *manner* in our English version, than *jus* in the Vulgate and δικαιωμα in the Septuagint. In some other places the word signifies merely a manner or custom, without implying any legal right. Thus Joseph interprets the dream of Pharaoh's butler, that he should again deliver the cup into his sovereign's hand, after the "former manner," when he was in office; Gen. xl. 13. Again, David is said to have destroyed all the inhabitants of the places on which he made inroads, while he was with Achish king of Gath, lest any of them should report, So did David, and so will be "his manner," all the time that he dwelleth in the country of the Philistines; 1 Sam. xxvii. 11. Nay, the word is used even for a very corrupt and illegal custom: and "the priests' custom with the people was," as the expression is in relation to a very unjustifiable practice of Eli's sons; 1 Sam. ii. 13.

That the king was bound by law, appears from the story of Ahab, who desired to purchase Naboth's vineyard; yet because the law forbad the alienation of lands from one tribe or family to another, he could not obtain it, till he had got Naboth condemned and executed for blasphemy and treason, whereupon his estate became forfeited to the crown; or the king, however, seized it; 1 Kings xxi. 1—16. From hence it appears, that the Hebrew monarch was only God's viceroy, or lieutenant, governing in all respects by his laws, which he could not alter, under pretext of amending or improving, nor abrogate or repeal on account of any pretended or apprehended inconvenience arising from them; and in matters of importance, when the law was not clear and certain, he was

* This is the opinion of Abarbanel, who quotes with approbation the following decision of Rabbi Jehuda: "Ista (de jure et judicio regis) non fuerunt dicta, nisi ad eos perterrefaciendos." Ubi supra, p. 446.

not to enact and determine by his own authority, but to consult the oracle, or God himself.

8thly. The king is charged to be humble, and to govern his subjects with lenity and kindness, not as slaves, but as brethren, Deut. xvii. 20. Thus David, addressing himself to his subjects, styles them his brethren, as well as his people; 1 Chron. xxviii. 2. The first Christian emperors imitated this example of the Hebrew kings; particularly Constantine the Great, who, in his epistle to the people of Antioch, styles them his brethren, whom he was bound to love.* And he concludes his letter to Eusebius with these words, ὁ Θεος σε διαφυλαξοι, αδελφε αγαπητε, "May God preserve you, beloved brother."† Other instances of the like sort may be found in Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History,‡ and in his Life of Constantine.§

Having considered the form of the kingly government, we proceed to the rites of inauguration, by which the person whom God had appointed to that office was actually invested with the royal dignity.

First. He was anointed. Godwin, following the talmudical rabbies,‖ asserts, that all kings were not anointed, but those only in whom the succession was broken; and then the first of the family was anointed for his successors, except in cases of dissension, when there was required a renewed unction for the confirmation of his authority. They say, therefore, Solomon, as well as his father David, was anointed, 1 Kings i. 39, because of the dispute between Adonijah and him, concerning the succession to the crown; and likewise Joash, the son of Ahaziah, 2 Kings xi. 12, because the succession had been interrupted by Athaliah's usurpation. But this opinion has no sufficient foundation in the sacred history; on the contrary, it seems more probable, that all kings were

* Euseb. de Vit. Constant. lib. iii. cap. lx.

† Ibid. cap. lxi.

‡ Lib. x. cap. v. et vii.

§ Lib. ii. cap. xlvi. et lib. iii. cap. xx.

‖ Maimon. de Regibus, cap. i. sect. x. xii. et Comment in Mishn. tit. Cherithoth, cap. i.; et Bartenor. in eundem loc. tom. v. p. 237, edit. Surenhus. See testimonies out of the Talmud, and other authors, in Selden, de Success. in Pontificat. lib. ii. cap. ix. apud Opera, vol. ii. tom. iii. p. 192, 193.

anointed; because king, and the anointed, seem in the following passages to be synonymous terms: "He shall give strength unto his king, and exalt the horn of his anointed," 1 Sam. ii. 10; and again, "David said unto him," that is, to the Amalekite who informed him that he had killed Saul, "How wast thou not afraid to stretch forth thy hand to destroy the Lord's anointed?" 2 Sam. i. 14; and, in his lamentation on this occasion, he hath these expressions, "The shield of the mighty is vilely cast away, the shield of Saul, as though he had not been anointed with oil;" ver. 21. These last words lose in a manner all their emphasis, supposing that no kings were anointed except the first of a family, or only in case the right of succession to the crown was uncertain. Nay, it should seem from this passage, that those kings whose right of succession was doubtful, which had occasioned their being anointed, were on this supposition more sacred than others. Farther, we read that Jehoahaz, the son of Josiah, when he was made king in his father's stead, was anointed, 2 Kings xxiii. 30, though there does not appear to have been any doubt or dispute about the succession.

The Hebrew doctors represent it to be the peculiar privilege of the kings of the family of David to be anointed with the same holy oil which was used in the consecration of the high-priest; and tell us, that the kings of the ten tribes were anointed with common oil.* But this opinion is hardly to be reconciled to a passage in the book of Exodus, where the use of the holy oil is appropriated to the consecration of Aaron and his sons, and the anointing any other person with it is expressly prohibited; Exod. xxx. 31, 32. They pretend, that a dispensation for the use of the holy oil, to anoint the kings, was afterward revealed to some prophet; but of this they produce no sort of evidence. It appears, indeed, that the oil with which Solomon was anointed was taken out of the tabernacle; 1 Kings i. 39. But that might as well be common oil, a considerable quantity of which was kept there for the use of the lamps, and which Zadoc the priest might have readier at hand on this occasion than any other. However, the following

* Talmud. Cherithoth, cap. iii.; vid. Hotting. de Jure Hebræor. leg. cix. p. 138. See also Schickard, de Jure Regio, cap. i. theor. iv. sect. xxxi. p. 78, 79. edit. Carpzov. Lipsiæ, 1674.

passage in the Psalms is alleged in favour of the opinion, that kings were anointed with the holy oil: "I have found David my servant: with my holy oil have I anointed him;" Psalm lxxxix. 20. But, as the person there spoken of, under the name of David,* undoubtedly means Christ, to whom alone a great part of what is said in that context will agree; therefore by the holy oil must be understood the influence of the Divine Spirit, which was "given to him without measure;" John iii. 34. And even if we suppose here is an allusion to the anointing of David, the Jewish king, yet the oil used on the occasion might possibly be styled holy, not because it was of that peculiar composition prescribed in the thirtieth chapter of Exodus, but because it was typical of the influence of the Holy Spirit.

We read of two different sorts of vessels, in which the oil wherewith kings were anointed was contained, the one called פך *pack*, which we translate a phial, 1 Sam. x. 1; the other called קרן *keren*, a horn, 1 Kings i. 39. Concerning the difference between these two vessels there are various conjectures. Some make it to lie in the matter of which they were formed; apprehending the פך *pack* was made of metal, either gold or silver, and the קרן *keren* of horn. Others place the difference in the shape; and tell us, that the קרן *keren* was like a horn, and the פך *pack* like a bottle. Others conceive the difference lay in the capacity of the vessels; and that the קרן *keren* contained a larger, the פך *pack* a smaller quantity. The rabbies make the anointing with the oil out of one or the other of these vessels, to be ominous of a longer or shorter reign. Accordingly they tell us, that Saul and Jehu were anointed out of the פך *pack*, 1 Sam. x. 1; 2 Kings ix. 3 (in the former of which texts *pack* is rendered in our English version a phial, in the latter, a box), to denote the shortness of their reigns; but David and Solomon out of the קרן *keren*, 1 Sam. xvi. 13, and 1 Kings i. 39, to denote the long succession of David's family.† But these are mere conjectures.

* It ought constantly to be remembered here, that David, in the Hebrew, signifies a person beloved, which eminently agrees to the Messiah.

† R. David Kimchi in 2 Reg. ix. See Schickard. de Jure Regio, cap. i. theor. iv. p. 79; Gemara, tit. Cherithoth. See Carpzov. not. (m) in loc. Schickard, jam. citat.

It is farther inquired, whose office and proper business it was to anoint the king; since we read of the ceremony's being performed by prophets and by priests: by prophets, as by Samuel, who anointed Saul and David; and by one of the sons of the prophets, who was sent by Elisha to anoint Jehu, 2 Kings ix. at the beginning: by priests, as by Zadoc, at the inauguration of Solomon, and by Jehoiada at the coronation of Joash; 2 Kings xi. 12. Here some distinguish between private and public anointing; the former, they suppose, was before the inauguration, and betokened the person's advancement to the throne some time afterward, which, they say, was performed by a prophet. The latter was at the time of the inauguration; and this, they say, was performed by the priest, as in the case of Solomon and Joash.*

As to the manner of performing this ceremony, all the account we have in Scripture is, that the oil was poured upon the head. When Samuel anointed Saul, he "took a phial of oil, and poured it on his head;" 1 Sam. x. 1. And when the prophet anointed Jehu, it is said, he poured the oil on his head; 2 Kings ix. 6. From hence it seems probable, that the kings were anointed in the same plentiful manner as the priests were at their consecration; the ointment, or oil, was poured upon the head in such a quantity as to run down upon the beard, and even to the skirts, or rather the collar, of the garment; for so על-פי מדותו *gnal-pi middothaiv* means in the following passage of the Psalmist, "It," that is, brethren's dwelling together in unity, "is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, that went down, *gnal-pi middothaiv*, to the skirts, or the collar, of his garments," Psalm cxxxiii. 2; *pi* signifying the hole in the midst of the robe of the ephod through which the head was put, and which was bound about, that it might not be rent; Exod. xxxix. 22, 23. The Jewish doctors, however, inform us of a difference between the manner of anointing a king and a priest; that the priest was anointed in the form of a Greek Chi, or St. Andrew's cross; and the king in the form of a circle round his head;† and likewise, that

* Vid. Scacchi Myrothecium, iii. cap. xlix. l. p. 1060, et seq. edit. Amstel. 1701.

† Obadias de Bartenora, et Maimon. in Mishn. tit. Cherithoth, cap. i.

the king must be anointed in the open air, and near a fountain; which they ground upon the history of Solomon's being brought to Gihon, which was a fountain, or brook, near Jerusalem, and there anointed by Zadoc; 1 Kings i. 38.* But from that particular circumstance in Solomon's inauguration, I see no reason to conclude it to have been a law for all succeeding kings to be anointed at fountains. The talmudists indeed, find a mystery in the kings being anointed by a fountain, as if it were intended to signify the desired perpetuity of his kingdom, or that it might continue like a fountain, which runs perpetually, and is never dry.†

We have only one remark more to make on this head; and that is, that the custom of consecrating of any thing to God by a profusion of oil upon it, appears to have been very ancient, from the instance of Jacob's anointing the pillar at Beth-el; Gen. xxviii. 18. But when it began, and how it was first introduced, we cannot so much as guess, any farther than that probably it was by a divine institution. We find it in use, through the whole Mosaic dispensation, in the dedication both of men and things to the immediate service of God. It was designed as emblematical of the gifts and graces of the Spirit of God, which are therefore expressed by unction in the New Testament; 1 John ii. 20. 27. And as Christ excelled all others in these gifts and graces, he was eminently called משיח *Massiach*, or MESSIAS, from משח *mashach*, to anoint. Which title is also given, in a lower sense, to the priest, Lev. iv. 3, and also to the kings of Israel, 1 Sam. xii. 3. 5.

We proceed now to the second ceremony at the inauguration of a king, which was, crowning him. There is a reference to it in these words of the Psalmist, "Thou preventest him," that is, the king, "with the blessings of goodness: thou settest a crown of pure gold on his head;" Psalm xxi. 3. And

tom. v. p. 237, edit. Surenhus. See passages of other authors in Selden, de Success. in Pontificat. lib. ii. cap. ix. apud Opera, vol. ii. tom. iii. p. 193---195.

* Vid. Maimon. de Regibus, cap. i. sect. xi., and a remarkable passage out of the Jerusalem and Babylonish Talmud, apud Schickard. Jus Regium Hebræor.; and Carpzovii notas, p. 71, 72, edit. Lips. 1674.

† The Talmud referred to above; and Ralbag and Abarbanel in 1 Kings i. 33; with other rabbinical commentators, apud Carpzov. notas, ubi supra.

we read expressly of its being performed at the inauguration of king Joash; 2 Kings xi. 12. What the form of the royal crown was, we do not pretend to determine; only observing, that the word נזר *nezer*, by which it is expressed, being used for the high-priest's crown, Exod. xxix. 6, which was merely a fillet or ribband bound round the head, with a plate of gold on the front of it, Exod. xxviii. 36, 37; it is probable the royal crown was much of the same shape, or like the diadem which we see on the heads of the ancient Roman kings on their medals. It seems to have been the custom of the Jewish kings, as well as those of the neighbouring nations, to wear their crown constantly when they were dressed. King Saul had his crown on when he was slain in the battle of Gilboa, 2 Sam. i. 10; and the king of the Ammonites, when he headed his army in war; for when David had reduced Rabbah, the royal city, he took the king's crown from his head, and put it on his own; 2 Sam. xii. 30. From this custom it may reasonably be inferred, that the ancient crowns were much less in size and weight than those which are now used by the European kings. Yet the crown of the king of the Ammonites, just mentioned, is said to "weigh a talent of gold, with the precious stones," *ubi supra*. Now a talent being reckoned to be one hundred and twenty-five pounds, such an enormous load on the head no man can be supposed to have carried, as a part of his ordinary dress. Bochart apprehends, with great probability, that the word משקל *mishkal* denotes, not the weight but the value of the crown;* for though the verb שקל *shakal*, in the Hebrew, like *pendere* in the Latin, related originally to weight; by which, before the invention of coins, metals were exchanged in traffic; yet, as we have shown in our lectures on medals, this word came afterward to be applied to the payment of money, when the custom of weighing it was laid aside. Thus the Septuagint renders שקל *shakal* by τιμαν, *estimare*, in the fifty-fifth chapter of Isaiah and the second verse; and accordingly the noun משקל *mishkal* may properly denote, not the weight of the crown but its value, by reason of the jewels that were set in it. Our translators, it seems, with several other learned men, suppose an *enaloge numeri* in the text; it being in the He-

* Hieroz. part i. lib. ii. cap. xxxviii.

brew יקרה ואבן *veeben jokrah*, and a precious stone; which, however, the Jews interpret more literally, of one jewel only; and this, Rabbi Kimchi tells us, was a magnet, by means of which this weighty crown was so supported in the air as to be no load to the man that wore it. But the conceit, of a magnet's being attracted by the air, is a piece of philosophy worthy only of a Jewish rabbi. Josephus says, this jewel was a sardonyx:* which notion, Bochart conjectures, might arise from the ancient Jews playing, in their manner, with the phrase עטרת מלכם, *gnatereth malcam*, the crown of the king. The word מלכם *malcam* having the same letters with מלכם *milcom*, the name of the god of the Ammonites, they made the expression to signify the crown of that god, who is otherwise called Moloch: and Moloch, it seems, or Molocas, is the Eastern name of the sardonyx; for Epiphanius,† speaking of the sardius, adds, εστι δε και αλλος (λιθος) Σαρδοννξ, ος καλειται Μολοχας.‡

The third ceremony at the inauguration of a king was the kiss of homage, which the Jews call the kiss of majesty. With respect to Saul we are informed, that "Samuel took a phial of oil, and poured it on his head, and kissed him;" 1 Sam. x. 1. This ceremony is probably alluded to in the following passage of the Psalmist, "Kiss the son, lest he be angry," &c. Psalm ii. 12; that is, acknowledge him as your king, pay him homage, and yield him subjection.

Fourthly. The acclamations of the people attended the ceremony of inauguration. Thus, in the case of Saul, we are informed, that "all the people shouted and said, God save the king;" 1 Sam. x. 24. And when Zadoc anointed Solomon, "they blew the trumpet and said, God save king Solomon;" 1 Kings i. 39.

It may be proper also to mention under this head, the royal robes, which, probably, were put on the king at his coronation. These, no doubt, were very rich and splendid, as may be concluded from our Saviour's declaring, in order to set forth the beauty which God had imparted to the lilies of the field, that

* Antiq. lib. vii. cap. vii. in fine, edit. Haverc.

† De duodecim Gemmis in Veste Aaronis, cap. i. apud Opera, tom. ii. p. 225, 226, edit. Petav. Colon. 1682.

‡ See Bochart. Hieroz. part ii. lib. v. cap. vii.

"even Solomon, in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these;" Matt. vi. 29. This allusion is the more apposite, if, as Josephus saith, Solomon was usually clothed in white.* And on this supposition, it is probable this was the colour of the royal robes of his successors. But it being likewise the colour of the priests' garments, the difference between them must be supposed to lie in the richness of the stuff they were made of. Upon this notion, that the ancient Jewish kings wore white garments, the rabbies call persons of distinguished birth and high rank חורים *chorim, albati,* in opposition to those of obscure birth and mean condition, whom they call חשוכים *chashuchim, tenebrosi, obscuri.* To this distinction St. James is supposed to allude, chap ii. 2, when he saith, if there come into your assembly a man εν εσθητι λαμπρα, which some render, in a white garment; and a poor man εν εσθητι ῥυπαρα, in a dark or dirty one. This criticism, however, wants a better support than the opinion of Josephus and the rabbies concerning the colour of the robes of the Jewish kings; it being certain that the word λαμπρος is applied by the Greek writers to any gay colour. Thus Plutarch saith,† that weak eyes are offended, προς απαν το λαμπρον. And Xenophon applies the word to such as are clothed in purple, or who are adorned with bracelets and jewels, and splendidly dressed.‡ In the book of the Revelation, λαμπρος is used to signify the brightness or splendour of the morning star, Rev. xxii. 16; and likewise, in general, such things as are pleasant and agreeable to the sight. Thus in the prophetic doom of the great city Babylon, it is said, "all things which were dainty and goodly, τα λιπαρα, και τα λαμπρα, are departed from thee," Rev. xviii. 14; that is, the things which St. John elsewhere expresses by "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes;" 1 John ii. 16. Our author's conjecture, therefore, that the Roman soldiers putting a purple, and Herod a white, garment on Christ, when in derision they clothed him as a king, was in conformity to the customs of their respective countries, is very pretty and ingenious, but not sufficiently supported; it being far from certain that white was the royal colour amongst

* Antiq. lib. viii. cap. vii. sect. iii. tom. i. p. 440, edit. Haverc.

† Citat. a Stephano.

‡ yropæd. lib. ii. p. 115, et 117, edit. Hutch. 1738.

the Jews. Something, however, concerning the ceremonies used at the inauguration of their kings, in the latter ages of their polity, may be conjectured with probability from the mock ceremonies which were paid to our blessed Saviour; see Matt. xxvii. 29.

It may not be improper to add a few words concerning the state and grandeur of the Jewish monarchs: which consisted, partly, in the profound respect that was paid them; of which we have many instances in their history; and, partly, in their attendants and guards; particularly the Cherethites and Pelethites, of whom we have frequent mention in the histories of David and Solomon. That they were soldiers, appears from their making part of David's army, when he marched out of Jerusalem on occasion of Absalom's conspiracy, 2 Sam. xv. 18; and likewise when they were sent against the rebel Sheba, the son of Bichri; chap. xx. 7. That they were a distinct corps from the common soldiers is evident from their having a peculiar commander, and not being under Joab, the general of the army; 2 Sam. viii. 16. 18. They seem, therefore, to have been the king's body-guard, like the Prætorian band among the Romans. The Cherethites were originally Philistines (see 1 Sam. xxx. 14, and 16, compared, and Zeph. ii. 5), who were skilful archers; and it is therefore supposed, that after the Israelites had suffered so much by the Philistine archers at the fatal battle of Gilboa, 1 Sam. xxxi. 3, David not only took care to have his people instructed in the use of the bow, 2 Sam. i. 18, but having made peace with the Philistines, hired a body of these archers (it may be with a view of instructing his own people), and made them his guards. With these were joined the Pelethites; who are supposed to have been native Israelites, for we find two of the name of Peleth among the Jewish families; one of the tribe of Reuben, Numb. xvi. 1; another of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. ii. 33. The Chaldee Paraphrase every where calls the Cherethites and Pelethites, archers and slingers. Their number may probably be gathered from the targets and shields of gold, which Solomon made for his guards, which were five hundred; see 1 Kings x. 16, 17, compared with 2 Chron. xii. 9—11.

As an article of the state and magnificence of the Jewish

kings, it may be proper to mention Solomon's royal throne, which was raised on six steps, adorned with the images of lions, and overlaid with ivory and gold; 1 Kings x. 18—20.

The last honours paid the king were at his death. It is said, the royal corpse was carried by nobles to the sepulchre, though it were at a very considerable distance.* However this be, we read of public mourning observed for good kings: 2 Chron. xxxv. 24; see also Jerem. xxii. 18; and xxxiv. 5. Yet, notwithstanding this royal state and grandeur, they were only God's viceroys, bound to govern according to the statute law of the land, which they, as well as their subjects, were required to obey. The rabbies tell us, that their violation of some laws was punished with whipping by order of the Sanhedrim; an account which is so utterly improbable, especially as not a single instance can be produced of this punishment being inflicted, that it would not deserve to be mentioned, were it not espoused by such learned men as Selden,† Schickard,‡ and Grotius.§ Besides what hath been observed against this notion by Leusden,‖ and Carpzovius,¶ I apprehend I have rendered it at least probable, that the Sanhedrim, to whom the rabbies ascribe such extraordinary powers, did not exist till the time of the Maccabees.

* Schickard. Jus Regium, cap. vi.; theor. xix. p. 415---417, edit. Carpzov. Lipsiæ, 1674.

† Selden. de Synedr. lib. ii. cap. ix. sect. v. apud Opera, vol. i. tom. ii. p. 1437, though afterward, having recited the arguments on both sides, he expresseth himself more doubtfully, lib. iii. cap. ix. sect. v. in fine.

‡ Schickard. de Jure Regio, cap. ii. theor. vii. p. 141, 142, edit. Carpzov.

§ Grot. de Jure Belli et Pacis, lib. i. cap. iii. sect. xx. 2, p. 79, 80, edit. Gronov. Hagæ, com. 1680. To account for this flagellation, he supposes it was not inflicted on the king by any others, as a punishment; but was a voluntary infliction of his own, as a token of his penitence. But this is not agreeable to the representation given by the Hebrew doctors.

‖ Leusden. Philolog. Hebræo mixt. dissert. xxv. sect. x. p. 167---169, edit. secund. Ultraject. 1682.

¶ Not. ad Schickard. loc. supra citat.

CHAPTER V.

OF THE HIGH-PRIESTS, PRIESTS, LEVITES, AND NETHINIMS.

With respect to the priests, we propose to inquire,

1st. What sort of officers in the Hebrew commonwealth they were: and,

2dly. To whom it appertained to execute that office.

Our first inquiry is, what sort of officers the priests were, who are called in the Hebrew כהנים *cohanim*. The reason of this inquiry is, because we find in Scripture the title *cohanim* applied to the officers of state, as well as to the ministers of the sanctuary. Thus, in the Second Book of Samuel, David's sons are said to have been *cohanim;* 2 Sam. viii. 18. That they were not ministers of the sanctuary is certain, because they were of the tribe of Judah, not of Levi, to which tribe the ecclesiastical ministry was by the law expressly limited. Their being called *cohanim*, therefore, can mean no other than as our translators render the word, chief rulers, or principal officers of state. And so, indeed, this title seems to be explained in the parallel place in Chronicles, where the sons of David are said to have been הראשנים ליד המלך *harishonim lejadh hammelek, primi ad manum regis,* "chief about the king;" 1 Chron. xviii. 17. Thus also Ira, the Jairite, is called כהן לדויד *cohèn lè-David*, which our translators render, "chief ruler about David;" 2 Sam. xx. 26. But more commonly the title *cohanim* is given to the minister of the sanctuary, who offered sacrifices, and other ways officiated in the public worship. Hence arises that uncertainty, whether Potipherah and Jethro, the former the father-in-law of Joseph, the latter of Moses, were ecclesiastical or civil persons; which our translators have expressed by calling them priests in the text, and prince in the margin: Gen. xli. 45; Exod. ii. 16. The true reason of the different application of the word

cohanim seems to be, that in the primary sense it imports those that minister to a king. They who were ליד המלך *lejadh hammelek*, about the king, or his ministers, were called his כהנים *cohanim*. And therefore, as God is a king, he had his *cohanim* as well as earthly monarchs, or such as attended on his special presence in the sanctuary, and ministered in the sacred service. Accordingly, having taken upon himself the character of the king of Israel, he commanded Moses to consecrate Aaron and his sons, לכהן לי *lecahèn li*, Exod. xxx. 30, to be his *cohanim*. Accordingly, God's *cohanim* are said to come near unto the Lord (Exod. xix. 22; Numb. xvi. 5), as the ministers of state come near to a king, and attend in his presence.

It has been made a question, in which sense we are to understand the word כהן *cohèn* in the following passage of the Psalmist: "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek;" Psalm cx. 4. Many of the later rabbies, who think David is the person there spoken of, understand by כהן *cohèn*, a king, in the civil and political, since it is certain David was not a *cohèn* in the ecclesiastical, sense.* But in this they are undoubtedly mistaken; for not only is it certain from several quotations, in the New Testament, of the Psalm, wherein this passage is contained, that it relates to Christ;† but the word *cohèn* is no where used to signify a king, but always one that ministers to a king. Melchizedek, it is true, was a king in Salem; nevertheless it was on account of another office which he executed, that he is called a *cohèn*, Gen. xiv. 18; namely, as he ministered *in sacris*, or in the solemnities of divine worship. He was a king over men, but at the same time a *cohèn* to the most high God. Of these sacred or ecclesiastical *cohamin*, we propose to discourse, and proceed to inquire,

2dly. To whom it appertained to execute the office of an ecclesiastical *cohèn*, or priest, especially in offering sacrifices.

In order to resolve this question, it will be necessary to distinguish the sacred rites into private, domestic, and public. It is supposed, that in the most ancient times every private

* R. David Kimchi in loc.

† And so it is understood by the ancient rabbies. See Owen on the Hebrews, vol. i. exercitat. ix. sect. xxvi.

person was allowed to offer sacrifices for himself. When Cain and Abel brought each of them an offering to the Lord, there is no mention of any priest officiating for them, though it does not appear that either of them sustained any public character, or had been consecrated to the sacerdotal office; see Gen. iv. The talmudists, indeed, are of opinion, that they brought their sacrifices to Adam, that he might offer them on their behalf; but of this there is not the least hint in the sacred history.* When a sacrifice was offered, or rather sacred rites were performed for a family, it seems to have been done by the head of it; thus Noah sacrificed for himself and family, Gen. viii. 20; and likewise Jacob, Gen. xxxv. 3. Job "offered burnt-offerings for his daughters and his sons, according to the number of them all;" chap. i. 5. It has been commonly supposed, rather than proved, that the priest's office was hereditary in every family, descending from the father to the eldest son. When, in process of time, several families were combined into nations and bodies politic, the king, as head of the community, officiated as priest for the whole. Thus Melchizedek was both king and priest in Salem; and Moses, as king in Jeshurun (which is another name for Israel), officiated as priest in the solemn national sacrifice offered on occasion of Israel's entering into covenant with God at Horeb. Moses sprinkled the blood of the sacrifice upon the altar, and upon the people; Exod. xxiv. 6. 8.

Indeed, the sacrifices are said to have been offered by "young men of the children of Israel, whom Moses sent or appointed," ver. 5: that is, says the Targum of Onkelos, by the first-born of the sons of Israel, who were the priests and sacrificers, till the Levites, being appointed instead of them, had the priesthood settled in their tribe. The Arabic and Persic versions favour this opinion. However, it is to be observed, that נערים *nangnarim*, which we render young men, does not always signify those who are young in years, but those who are fit for service; and accordingly it is applied to ministers, or servants of any kind: Gen. xiv. 24; xxii. 3; 2 Sam. xviii. 15; 1 Kings xx. 14. There is no necessity, therefore, that we should understand by the נערים *nangnarim*, whom Moses sent to offer burnt-offerings, and to sacrifice

* Vid. Heidegger. Histor. Patriarch. tom. i. exercitat. v. p. 177.

peace-offerings, proper priests, consecrated to that office; for they might be only servants, employed to kill and prepare the sacrifices, while he, as priest, sprinkled the blood of them on the altar, and on the people. Moses is, therefore, by the Psalmist, called a priest: "Moses and Aaron among his priests;" Psalm xcix. 6.

But when God made a more perfect settlement of their constitution, and gave them his law at Sinai, he allotted the public sacerdotal office to Aaron and his sons, and entailed it on their posterity; and though the whole tribe of Levi, to which Aaron belonged, was appointed to the service of the sanctuary, namely, to perform the lower offices relating to the public worship, yet it was now made a capital crime for any, besides Aaron, and his sons and descendants, to officiate as priests, in the more solemn acts of offering sacrifices, burning incense, and blessing the people. Insomuch that when Korah and his companions (though Korah was of the tribe of Levi) attempted to invade the priest's office, Numb. xvi. 10, God executed his vengeance upon them in a very remarkable manner, as a warning to all others, ver. 31—33, and confirmed the priesthood anew to Aaron and his family by the miraculous sign of the budding of his rod; chap. xvii. It was now no more lawful for the king, than for the meanest of the people, to officiate in the priest's office. This is evident from the remonstrance which Azariah and his companions made to king Uzziah, when he "went into the temple of the Lord, to burn incense upon the altar of incense" (perhaps out of a vain ambition of imitating the heathen kings, who in many places executed the priesthood, and that he might in all respects appear as great as they); and from the judgment which God inflicted upon him for it; 2 Chron. xxvi. 16. 21.

Here a considerable difficulty arises, in that after the giving of the law (by which the priesthood was limited to Aaron's family), we have an account of several kings, judges, and prophets, taking upon them to officiate as priests, sacrificing and blessing the people, who yet were not of the family of Aaron, nor of the tribe of Levi, without any censure passed upon them; nay, it should seem, with the divine approbation. Samuel, who was of the tribe of Ephraim, was waited for, that, according to his custom, he might bless the sacrifice,

1 Sam. ix. 13. And, on another occasion, he "offered a lamb for a burnt-offering to the Lord;" 1 Sam. vii. 9. Both which acts did properly belong to the priest. King Saul offered a burnt-offering, 1 Sam. xiii. 9; and David offered "burnt-offerings and peace-offerings before the Lord, and blessed the people in the name of the Lord of hosts;" 2 Sam. vi. 17, 18. Solomon, likewise, blessed the people, as well as prayed in the public congregations, at the dedication of the temple; 1 Kings vii. 54. And the prophet Elijah sacrificed a bullock; 1 Kings xviii. 30.

The common solution of this difficulty is, that these kings and prophets caused the priests to perform the sacrifices for them, and are said to do what was done by their order. But this sense of the expressions used on these occasions, is too forced to be easily admitted. What Elijah is said to have done, in particular, in the forecited passage, seems evidently to have been done by himself; and cannot, without great force upon the words, be understood of any other person's doing it for him. The difficulty, therefore, is perhaps better solved by supposing, that when these persons acted as priests, they did it not, as being heads of the people, but as being prophets, and under the special direction of the Spirit of God, who had, no doubt, a right to dispense with his own laws, and sometimes did, on extraordinary occasions. Some, on this principle, interpret the words of Samuel to Saul; "The Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy; then do thou as occasion shall serve thee, for God is with thee," 1 Sam. x. 6, 7; that is, according to them, when thou art thus endowed with the Spirit, thou mayest follow his directions upon all emergencies, without regarding the letter of the law. Though this will not excuse his sacrificing, because from his own account it appears, that he did not do it by special divine direction, but contrary to his judgment; he "forced himself to it," according to his own expression, "and did it out of fear;" 1 Sam. xiii. 11, 12.

With respect to the different orders and ranks of priests, and of other ministers about the Jewish temple-service, Godwin saith, they were three, Priests, Levites, and Nethinims; and he adds, they may be paralleled with ministers, deacons, and subdeacons in the primitive church; and over them the

high-priest was chief. In this manner the Papists pretend to found their ecclesiastical hierarchy on the Jewish establishment; comparing the pope with the high-priest, the clergy with the priests, the lay monks and cathedral officers, such as their singing men and boys, &c., with the Levites and Nethinims. But the author has not produced, from the New Testament, his evidence of such a distinction of ministers in the primitive Christian church as he here speaks of. There we have not the least intimation of two sorts of deacons, the one preachers, the other not; but only of one sort, whose province was to take care of the poor, and of the other temporal matters relating to the church.* But to return.

The priesthood was entailed on the posterity of Aaron, in whom the succession was continued, Exod. xxviii. 43, and xxix. 9; and he having four sons, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, 1 Chron. vi. 3, they, together with their father, were consecrated to the sacerdotal office. It was not long before Nadab and Abihu were both struck dead by fire from heaven. The crime, thus severely punished, was their presuming to burn incense in the tabernacle with other fire than that which God had commanded to be used, Lev. x. 1, 2, and which he ordered to be kept constantly burning on the altar, having been first lighted by a flash from heaven, whereby the first victims that were offered on the altar, after it was erected, had been consumed in the presence of the people; Lev. ix. 24. As, immediately upon this, Aaron and all the priests were forbid to drink wine, or any other intoxicating liquors, whenever they went into the tabernacle, "lest they should die," Lev. x. 9, the Jews, with some reason, conclude, that the crime of these two priests was their being drunk when they went to officiate in the tabernacle.

Nadab and Abihu thus dying before their father, and leaving no children, 1 Chron. xxiv. 2, there remained Eleazar and Ithamar, in whose posterity the family of Aaron, or of the priests, was distinguished into two branches. Godwin saith, that "the high priesthood was tied or limited to the line of Aaron's first born," that is, to the line of Eleazar, who immediately succeeded his father in the office of high-priest,

* See the account of their institution and office, Acts vi., at the beginning.

Numb. xx. 26. 28, and was succeeded by his eldest son Phinehas, who had the dignity confirmed to him, and entailed on the line of his posterity, for the pious zeal which he showed against idolatry and lewdness. "Behold, I give him my covenant of peace, saith God, and he shall have it, and his seed after him, even the covenant of an everlasting priesthood;" Numb. xxv. 12, 13. However, this promise must be understood conditionally, in case the eldest branch of his house was fit to discharge this high office, or did not forfeit the dignity by some notorious wickedness; for upon any such failure in the line of Phinehas, it was to be transferred to the eldest branch of the line of Ithamar. Accordingly, we find there were several changes from one line to the other, between the death of Aaron and the captivity of Israel. It first continued through seven successions in the line of Eleazar, and was then translated to the line of Ithamar, in the person of Eli, who was both high-priest and judge in Israel. That he was of the family of Ithamar, not of Eleazar, is concluded from his name not being inserted in the genealogy of Eleazar, 1 Chron. vi. 3, &c.; and from Josephus's saying that he was of the family of Ithamar.* Eli, then, was the first of that line who was raised to this high dignity, and in his family it continued till the reign of Saul, who caused Ahimelech, the son of Ahitub, to be slain, and probably transferred the priesthood to Zadoc, who was of the Phinehan line; for in David's time we find Zadoc joined with Abiathar (who had escaped the massacre of the priests of Ithamar's line) in the execution of the high priesthood; 2 Sam. xx. 25. It may be presumed, that Zadoc having been advanced by Saul, and being also of the eldest line of Aaron's family, David did not choose to depose him, and therefore joined him with Abiathar, whose father and other relations had lost their lives on his account, and whom he had acknowledged as high-priest, and had accordingly inquired of the Lord by him, presently after his father's death; 1 Sam. xxiii., beginning. And thus Zadoc and Abiathar continued partners in this dignity through the reign of David. It is said, indeed, in the account of this king's principal officers and ministers in the Second Book of Samuel, that "Zadoc, the son of Ahitub, and Ahimelech, the son of Abiathar, were

* Antiq. lib. v. cap. ult.

the priests;" 2 Sam. viii. 17. In this passage here are two things which require explanation: the first is, that Ahimelech is said to be the son of Abiathar, whereas Abiathar was the son of Ahimelech. But this difficulty is removed by the easy supposition, that Abiathar might have a son, called after his father Ahimelech. The second is, that Ahimelech, instead of his father Abiathar, is joined as priest with Zadoc. The most probable solution of this is, that Abiathar, through indolence or sickness, not much attending to the duty of his office, his son Ahimelech commonly officiated for him; and on that account, he, rather than his father, is named with Zadoc, as executing the priest's office. Afterward, when Solomon was fixed on his throne, he degraded Abiathar for his treason in the conspiracy of Adonijah, 1 Kings ii. 27, and put Zadoc in his room, ver. 35, that is, established him in the office alone: and in his line the succession continued till the captivity. But though Abiathar was turned out of his office, it seems he was still honoured with the title of high-priest as before; for, presently after, we find him named with Zadoc, as in David's time; 1 Kings iv. 4. The truth is, he was now reduced to the same rank which the eldest branch of the line of Ithamar held, before the translation of the priesthood to Eli, that is, he was second in the ecclesiastical dignity. This probably was the case with Zephaniah, mentioned by the prophet Jeremy, who styles "Seraiah the chief, and Zephaniah the second priest," Jer. lii. 24, these two being the eldest branches of the two lines of Aaron's family.

Many have been the conjectures concerning the reason of the first translation of the high priesthood from Eleazar's to Ithamar's family, in the person of Eli. One is, the idolatry which Micah introduced among the Israelites, which the high-priest is supposed to have countenanced and encouraged; see Judges xviii.

To this it may be objected, not only that this idolatry seems to have been peculiar to the tribe of Dan, or rather to a small part of that tribe which settled at Laish, ver. 28—30; but that, though the history of this affair is placed near the end of the book of Judges, it is generally thought to have happened soon after the death of Joshua,* before there was "any judge

* Josephus seems to have been of this opinion concerning the early date

in Israel;"* that is, at least three hundred years before the translation of the priesthood out of Eleazar's family. And it cannot be supposed, that if the degradation of that family had been the punishment of this sin, it would have been so long delayed.

Dr. Lightfoot conjectures, that God's depriving Eleazar's family of the pontifical dignity for several successions, was on account of the ignorance or carelessness of the high-priest, in suffering Jephthah to sacrifice his daughter:† whence you will observe, it was his opinion he did actually sacrifice her. After all, nothing can be advanced here beyond bare conjecture, the Scripture no where informing us of the reason for which the line of Eleazar was thus degraded. But, considering how many legal imperfections would disqualify a man for that high dignity, it is no wonder that the lineal succession was often interrupted, and the second priest, or the head of one line of Aaron's family, placed above the natural successor in the other line. However, it has been generally thought, and with reason, that some enormous crime was the cause of the first translation from the family of Eleazar to that of Ithamar; partly, because God had by covenant entailed the succession on the Phinehan line, as was observed before; and partly, because the next translation back again, from the line of Ithamar to that of Eleazar, was on account of the sins of Eli's sons. "I chose the house of thy father Aaron," saith God to Eli by the prophet, "to offer up incense and sacrifices upon mine altar. Why then do ye kick at my sacrifices? Therefore, though I said that thine house should stand before me for ever, now be it far from me. Behold the days come, that thou shalt see an enemy in thine habitation, and I will raise me up a faithful priest;" 1 Sam. ii. 27, &c. By an enemy, or rival (as some would translate the word צר *tsar*), may probably be meant the eldest branch of the other line, who, though set aside for a time, was to be reinstated in the supreme dignity.

of Micah's idolatry; for he places the story of the Levite, related in the next chapter, soon after the death of Joshua. Antiq. lib. v. cap. ii.

* See ver. 1; and likewise above, book i. chap. i. p. 46.

† Lightfoot's Harmony of the Old Testament, on Judges xi. xii. sub Anno Mundi, 2819.

There appear, by the Scripture account, to have been thirty high priests from Aaron to Jozedeck, who was carried captive into Babylon; yet we cannot be sure there were no more, since the Scripture no where professes to give us an exact list. After the captivity, the regularity of succession was little regarded. The Jews acknowledge that some got into the office by money;* and it is said, that some of the high-priests destroyed one another by witchcraft. Whether we give credit to this account or not, it shows that several of them, in those latter ages of the Jewish church, were corrupt and vicious men, and left a very bad character behind them. Some rabbies reckon eighty high-priests, from the return from the Babylonish captivity to the destruction of the second temple; others eighty-four or eighty-five.†

We now proceed to consider,

1st. The consecration of the Jewish priests to their office; and,

2dly. The office itself, to which they were consecrated; showing under both heads in what respects the high-priest and the inferior priests were alike, and wherein they differed.

In discoursing of the consecration of the high-priest, Godwin begins with the anointing of him, as one thing wherein he differed from the inferior priests. But the Scripture mentions his being clothed with the pontifical garments, as previous to his unction: "The holy garments of Aaron shall be his sons' after him, to be anointed therein, and to be consecrated in them;" Exod. xxix. 29. There was still another ceremony, previous both to anointing and clothing, and common to the high-priest and to the inferior priests, namely, their being

* Vid. Bartenora, et Maimon. in Mishn. tit. Joma. cap. i. sect. iii. tom. ii. p. 208, edit. Surenhus.

† On the succession of the high-priests, consult Selden de Successione in Pontificatum; Reland. Antiq. Hebræ. part ii. cap. iii.; and Prideaux's Connect. part i. book i. sub anno 656 ante Christum. Selden's second book De Successione in Pontif. contains a large account out of the rabbies of the inquiries which were made previous to the initiation of the high-priest, whether he was next in blood, and born of a marriage allowed by the law; whether he was of a proper age, that is, arrived to puberty; whether he had any bodily defect, or was addicted to any vice which disqualified him. The like inquiries are said to have been made, mutatis mutandis, concerning the common priests, previous to their consecration.

washed with water: "Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shalt wash them with water;" ver. 4. From hence, some explain those words of our Saviour to John the Baptist, when he desired to be baptized of him: "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness," Matt. iii. 15; that is, being about to enter on his priestly office, it became him to be baptized, or washed, according to the law which he was subject to; or, as the apostle expresses it, "was made under;" Gal. iv. 4. Others think, that "fulfilling all righteousness" here means, owning and complying with every divine institution, which John's baptism was.* Be this as it will, the ceremonial washing of all the priests was, doubtless, designed to be typical of that purity of heart and life which is declared to be essential to the ministers of the gospel; 1 Tim. iii. 2. 7, and elsewhere.

We now proceed to consider the unction, which was another ceremony at the consecration of the priests. Godwin represents this anointing (which term, he seems to think, intimates the profusion of the oil used on the occasion) as peculiar to the high-priest; whereas the second priests, he saith, were only sprinkled with this oil, mingled with the blood of the sacrifices. But in this he is undoubtedly mistaken; for as the ceremony of sprinkling was common to Aaron and his sons, Lev. viii. 30, so also was the anointing. Thus the Lord spake unto Moses, "Thou shalt anoint Aaron and his sons, and consecrate them, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office;" Exod. xxx. 30. Again, it is said, "These are the names of the sons of Aaron, the priests, who were anointed, whom he consecrated to minister in the priest's office, even Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar;" Numb. iii. 3. There seems, however, to have been this difference between the high-priest and the common priests, that every high-priest was anointed at his consecration, at least before the captivity; whereas none of the common priests were anointed after the immediate sons of Aaron. Every high-priest, I say, was anointed; only when Eleazar succeeded his father in the high priesthood, the ceremony of anointing seems

* Witsii Miscell. tom. ii. lib. ii. dissert. ii. sect. 47.

to have been omitted at his consecration, because he had been anointed before, when he was consecrated a common priest. There is no other account, therefore, of the ceremony of his instalment, but his being clothed with his father's pontifical garments; Numb. xx. 28. That the succeeding high-priests were anointed at their consecration, may be certainly inferred from that perpetual law concerning the high-priest (meaning not only Aaron, but any of his successors in that office), wherein he is called "the priest that is anointed:" Lev. iv. 3; see also ver. 16. And this being the distinguishing character of the high-priest, it may likewise be inferred, that the common priests, the successors of Aaron's sons, were not anointed.

Maimonides and the talmudical rabbies speak much of a *sacerdos ad bellum unctus*, or priest anointed for war, who, they say, was anointed with the same oil that the high-priest was, as being little inferior to him in dignity, though in the sanctuary he ministered only as a common priest, and wore no other garments than they did. His proper office, as they inform us, was to attend the camp in time of war, and encourage the people to the battle, according to the following law: "And it shall be, when ye are come nigh unto the battle, that the priest shall approach, and speak unto the people, and shall say unto them, Hear, O Israel, you approach this day unto battle against your enemies: let not your hearts faint; fear not, and do not tremble, neither be ye terrified because of them. For the Lord your God is he that goeth with you, to fight for you against your enemies, to save you;" Deut. xx. 2—4. Maimonides saith, that when he, who is anointed for the war, standing on a high place, before the whole army, hath pronounced these words in the holy tongue, another priest under him proclaimeth it to all the people with a loud voice: and then the anointed priest saith, "What man is there that hath built a new house, and hath not dedicated it? Let him go and return to his house, lest he die in the battle, and another man dedicate it. What man is there that hath planted a vineyard, and hath not yet eaten of it? Let him also go and return unto his house, lest he die in the battle, and another man eat of it. What man is there that hath betrothed a wife, and hath not taken her? Let him go and return unto

his house, lest he die in battle, and another man take her;" Deut. xx. 5—7. Thus much the anointed priest speaketh, and the officer proclaimeth it aloud to the people. Afterward the officer himself speaketh, and saith, "What man is there that is fearful and faint-hearted? Let him go and return unto his house, lest his brethren's heart faint as well as his heart," Deut. xx. 8; and another officer proclaims it to the people.* Now, though it may be very naturally supposed, that some of the priests attended the camp, as a kind of chaplains to the regiments, and as having some particular service assigned them, which made their presence necessary, namely, to blow with the trumpets, Numb. x. 8, 9, and to encourage the people; nevertheless, that there was one priest peculiarly consecrated to this service, and of superior dignity to the common priests, does not appear in Scripture; and we have, therefore, no reason to believe (notwithstanding this rabbinical fiction) that any priests, after the sons of Aaron, were anointed, but the high-priest only.

The ointment, or oil, with which the priest was anointed, is described, and there is a receipt for making it in the book of Exodus, chap. xxx. 23—25. It was compounded of spicy drugs, namely, myrrh, sweet cinnamon, sweet calamus, and cassia, mixed with oil olive. Maimonides pretends to tell us the manner of making this mixture. "Each of these four spices," saith he, "was pounded separately: then they were all mixed together, and a strong decoction of them made with water, which, being strained from the ingredients, was boiled up with the oil, till the water was all evaporated."† The rabbies are very positive, that no more of this holy oil was made after that which Moses made, for anointing the tabernacle, and the first set of priests.‡ And they ground

* Maimon. de Regibus, chap. vii. sect. i.—iv.

† De Apparatu Templi, cap. i. sect. i. apud Crenii Fasciculum Sextum, p. 84, et seq.; Comment. in Mishn. tit. Cherithoth, cap. i. sect. i. tom. v. p. 237, 238, edit. Surenhus; Hotting. de Legibus Hebræor. sect. cvii. cviii.; et Schickard. Jus Regium Hebræor cum notis Carpzov. theor. iv. p. 63, et seq.

‡ Vid. Talmud. Cherithoth, cap. i.; et Schickard. Jus Regium; et Carpzov. not. p. 67—71.

their opinion on the following passage, which they understand as a prohibition of making it in any future time: "This shall be an holy anointing oil unto me throughout your generations. Upon man's flesh it shall not be poured, neither shall ye make any other like it, after the composition of it; it is holy, and shall be holy unto you. Whosoever compoundeth any like it, or whosoever putteth any of it upon a stranger, shall even be cut off from his people;" Exod. xxx. 31—33. But this only means, as Christopher Cartwright justly observes,* that none of it should be made for any private or profane use; not that when it was necessary for the holy purposes for which it was appointed, no fresh quantity should ever be made by the original receipt. Indeed, I can see no reason why a receipt should be given for making it, if no more was to be made after that first parcel. Besides, the quantity made by Moses with one hin of oil, a measure, according to Bishop Cumberland, little more than a wine gallon, could not be much more than was sufficient for anointing the tabernacle and all its furniture, the altar and all its vessels, the laver, and Aaron and his four sons; ver. 26—30. Or if any after all remained, it could not be sufficient for anointing the succeeding high-priests for many ages; nor would it keep so long, but evaporate and be dried up. The rabbies, indeed, always dexterous at unravelling difficulties, tell us, it was miraculously preserved,† like the pot of manna in the ark of the covenant, and was multiplied like the widow's cruse of oil, 1 Kings xvii. 14. They, however, acknowledge it was lost in Josiah's time, about fifty years before the destruction of the temple, and that after that no more high-priests were anointed.‡ But if by the "two anointed ones," spoken of by Zechariah, "that stand by the Lord of the whole earth," Zech. iv. 14, are meant (as Kimchi and many others understand that passage) Joshua the high-priest, and Zerubbabel the governor, who

* Electa Targumico-Rabbinica in Exod. xxx. 33.

† Schickard. ubi supra, p. 69; Talmud. Cherithoth, cap. i. et iii.; vid. Hottinger. de Juris Hebræor. Legibus, leg. cix. cx. p. 138, 139, edit. Tiguri, 1655.

‡ Talmud. Cherithoth, cap. i.; et Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, cap. i. sect. viii.; vid. Schickard. ubi supra, p. 69, 70.

acted as king of the Jews, this will be an evidence, that anointing was used even after the captivity. Eusebius is of opinion, that it continued in use till our Saviour's time.*

As to the manner of performing this ceremony, the rabbies relate it with as much particularity and confidence as if they had been eye-witnesses of it. They tell us, indeed, they had the account of it from their wise men, and they had it from the prophets, who had seen it performed. They inform us, that the oil was poured on the top of the priest's head, which was bare, so plentifully, as to run down his face upon his beard to the collar of his robe; and some say, that he who anointed him, drew on his forehead, with his finger, the figure of the Greek Caph, or Kappa, the first letter of the word כהן *cohèn*. Whereas others make it to be the figure of the Greek Chi,* which some suppose was for the first letter in χριω, *ungo*, and χριστος, *unctus*, in which they discover a great typical mystery. But all which can with any certainty be depended upon is that very brief account given us in Leviticus: "And Moses poured the anointing oil upon Aaron's head;" Lev. viii. 12. And by the Psalmist, when he compares brotherly love and unity to "the precious ointment on the head, that ran down upon Aaron's beard, that went down to the skirts," or the collar, "of his garments;" Ps. cxxxiii. 2. Some suppose, that, at the consecration of the high-priest, this unction was repeated seven days together, an opinion which they ground upon a passage in the book of Exodus, where that "son of Aaron, who is priest in his stead," that is, high-priest, is enjoined, "when he cometh into the tabernacle of the congregation, in order to minister in the holy place, to wear those garments, in which he was anointed and consecrated, seven days;" Exod. xxix. 29, 30. But it does not follow, that therefore he was to be anointed seven times over.

The high-priest being represented in the New Testament as a type of Christ, Godwin very reasonably supposes his unction to be typical of those extraordinary gifts and influences of the Spirit with which the human nature of our Lord was endowed, and which, in allusion to this type, are

* Euseb. Demonst. Evang. lib. viii. p. 387, edit. Paris, 1628.

† Vid. de Bartenora et Maimonidem in Mishn. tit. Cherithoth, cap. i. sect. i. et Selden. de Success. in Pontificat. lib. ii. cap. ix.

expressed by anointing him: "God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows;" Psalm xlv. 7. It is observed, that this spiritual unction of Christ was not performed at once, but at three different times, each effusion being more plentiful than the former. The first was at his birth, and in his minority; and it appeared in the extraordinary wisdom which he discovered at twelve years old, insomuch, that when at that early age he taught in the temple among the scribes and doctors, "all who heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers;" Luke ii. 47. The second was at his baptism, when the Spirit of God descended like a dove, and lighted upon him; Matt. iii. 16. The third, and most complete, was upon his ascension, when he "received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, which he shed forth upon his disciples;" Acts ii. 33. The prophecy of the Psalmist, contained in the forty-fifth Psalm, to which I referred above, relates, I apprehend, not so much to the two former unctions, which were designed to qualify him for his ministry on earth, as to that which he received after his ascension, in reward of his humiliation and obedience.

The second part of the ceremony of consecration was enrobing the priests with the sacerdotal vestments. These were eight, four common to the high-priest and inferior priests, and four peculiar to the high-priest. The former were the drawers or breeches, the coat, the girdle, and the bonnet or turban; Exod. xxviii. 40—42. The latter, the robe, the ephod, the breast-plate, and the holy crown. All these garments, especially those peculiar to the high-priest, were exceeding rich and sumptuous; the colours gay, and disposed in a beautiful contrast; they were ornamented with rich embroidery, and set off with gold and jewels; and, no doubt, they were very graceful in their shape and form, according to the taste of those times. Little, indeed, can be advanced with certainty concerning the fashion of several of these vestments, Moses having left us hardly any thing more than their names. Josephus, indeed, hath given a particular description of them all,* and, doubtless, a very faithful one, according to their fashion in his time. But who can say, how far it might have altered during many ages, and in such various changes as the

* Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vii. tom. i. p. 138, edit. Haverc.

Hebrew commonwealth had undergone, from the time of Moses? The account given by the rabbies is very different from his; and St. Jerome's, as to some of these garments, different from both. The moderns, who have set before us lively descriptions, in writing, and in pictures, vary so much, that some of them seem to have furnished the world with new models for masquerade habits, rather than to have delineated the real fashion of the pontifical vestments.* This caution premised, we shall endeavour to give you the best account we can of these garments, in the order in which they were put on.

The first was the מכנסי-בד *michnese-badh*, which we render "linen breeches;" Exod. xxviii. 42. And according to Josephus, it much resembled the modern garment, which we call by that name; for he says it was fastened round the middle, εμβαινοντων εις αυτο των ποδων, the feet or legs being put into it.† Its use was "to cover their nakedness," as it is expressed in the book of Exodus; that is, for the sake of decency, when they stood aloft on the altar, and the people were beneath them, or even when they were on the ground, stooping to perform any part of the sacred service. Moses has left us no description of these drawers, only that they were made of linen, and that they were to "reach from the loins even to the thighs;" that is, according to the rabbies, to the bottom of the thighs, or to the knees. They also inform us, that the waistband was a little above the navel, and near the heart; and that they were tied about the waist with a string, run through the waistband, in the manner of a purse. This garment was common to the high-priests and to the inferior priests.‡

That no such garment was wore in Noah's time, seems evident, from the story of his being uncovered in his tent, Gen. ix. 21; nor by the Jews in the time of Moses, except by the priests, and that perhaps only when they were officiating at the altar, as may be reasonably conjectured from the law in

* Among others, compare Braunius de Vestitu Sacerd. p. 646, 647. 655, edit. 1701; or Witsii Miscell. tom. i. lib. ii. dissert. ii. sect. xlviii., with Calmet's Dictionary, under the word priest.

† Antiq. ubi supra, sect. i. p. 139.

‡ Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, cap. viii. sect. xviii. p. 146; Crenii Fasciculi Sexti.

Deuteronomy against the immodest woman, Deut. xxv. 11; for if it had been commonly wore, she could not easily have committed the crime for which she was condemned to lose her hand. Probably, in David's time, it was worn only by the priests, which may be the reason that when Hanun, king of the Ammonites, "shaved off half the beards of David's servants," or ambassadors, "and cut off their garments in the middle, even to their posteriors," and dismissed them in this disgraceful and indecent condition, "they were greatly ashamed;" 2 Sam. x. 4, 5. That this garment was not used among the Romans, in latter times, even by their priests, appears from Martial's ludicrous description of one who was sacrificing:

> Ipse super virides aras luctantia pronus
> Dum resecat cultro colla, premitque manu,
> Ingens iratis apparuit hernia sacris.*

Suetonius's account of the manner of Julius Cæsar's death, makes it more than probable that he wore no such garment. "Utque animadvertit undique se strictis pugionibus peti, toga caput obvolvit: simul sinistra manu sinum ad ima crura deduxit, quo honestius caderet; etiam inferiore corporis parte velata."† Upon the whole, it may be reasonably concluded, that the use of this decent garment had its origin from the divine institution of the Jewish priesthood.

The second garment, which was put on after the breeches, was the כתנת *chethoneth*, or coat, as it is called in our translation; Exod. xxviii. 40. It was made of linen; Exod. xxxix. 27. We have no description of the fashion of it in Scripture, except in the visionary appearance of Christ to St. John, in the form and habit of a priest, Rev. i. 13; and he is said to be ενδεδυμενος ποδηρη, "clothed with a garment down to the feet," which perfectly agrees with the description the Jewish writers give of the *chethoneth;* who say, that it reached down to the feet; and that it likewise had sleeves which came down to the wrist, and was tied about the neck, in the same manner as the breeches about the waist; so that it was not much unlike a long shirt.‡ It was common to the high-priest

* Lib. iii. epigram. 24. † In Vita Jul. Cæs. cap. lxxxii.

‡ Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, cap. viii. sect. xvii. apud Crenii Fascicul. Sextum, p. 146. "De longitudine tunicarum, erant illæ talares, qua-

and the inferior priests; except that, perhaps, the tunic of the high-priest was rather made of finer linen, or wove in a more curious manner; for it is called כתנת תשבץ *chethoneth tashbèts*, which we render the "broidered coat;" Exod. xxviii. 4. Ainsworth translates it, "a coat of circled work;" and observes, that it differed from broidered work, because that was of various colours, whereas this coat was all white, but wove in circles, or round hollow places, like eyes. The same word, he remarks, is used afterwards, ver. 11, for *ouches*, or hollow sockets, in which jewels were set. Dr. Lightfoot conceives this tunic to be a sort of diaper, wove in some figure, as circles, or checkers.* The high-priest, when he went into the holy of holies on the day of expiation, was clothed only in the *vestes albæ*, as they are commonly called, or the garments of the common priests, Lev. xvi. 4; yet the tunic which he then wore is supposed to be somewhat different from, and perhaps meaner than theirs; that it might be more suitable to the peculiar service and deep humiliation of that day. This is thought to be intimated, in the coats made in common for Aaron and his sons being called כתנת שש *chethoneth shèsh*, Exod. xxxix. 27; whereas the tunic which the high-priest wore on the solemn feast day, is called כתנת-בד *chethoneth-badh*; Lev. xvi. 4. The *shèsh* is imagined to be a fine sort of Egyptian linen, such as was worn by their princes; for with it Pharaoh clothed Joseph; Gen. xli. 42. Some take it to be a fine cotton; whereas the word בד *badh*, is supposed to import a common and meaner sort.†

Braunius is of opinion, that there was no difference between the *shèsh* and the *badh*, as to the fineness of the stuff, the *michnese badh*, or linen breeches, being spoken of as made of שש משזר *shèsh moshzor*, "fine twined linen," as our translators render it. And the only difference between them, which he assigns, is, that the *badh* (being derived from בדד *badhadh*, *solus*) was made of a single thread, and the *shèsh* (which word

rum manicæ pertinebant ad volam manus, et pro latitudine manus patebant." See other testimonies apud Braunium de Vestitu Sacerd. lib. ii. cap. ii. sect. vii. p. 461, edit. 1680, sect. cccxli. p. 372, edit. 1701.

* Temple Service, chap. iii.

† Vid. Cunæum de Repub. Hebr. lib. ii. cap. i.; et Leusden. Philol. Hebr. mixt. dissert. xxvii. p. 179, 180.

signifies six) was composed of several, perhaps six, threads twisted together. He supports this sentiment by the testimony of Maimonides, and various other Jewish doctors.*

The third garment was the אבנט *abnèt,* or girdle; Exod. xxviii. 40. This was likewise made of the שש *shèsh,* or fine twined linen, and curiously embroidered with a variety of colours; Exod. xxxix. 29. Moses has not acquainted us either with the length or breadth of this girdle. But Josephus and the rabbies have given us the measure of it, though their accounts are very different. It went, according to Josephus, twice about the waist.† But Maimonides makes it to be thirty-two ells long.‡ If this account be true, the use of it seems to have been, not only to bind the tunic close and tight, but to serve for a warm upper garment, by swathing the body from the arms to the waist; and also to strengthen the back for the laborious work of killing, dressing, and burning the sacrifices. However, Josephus's account seems the more probable; partly, because so warm a dress would, in that warm climate, have been highly inconvenient, especially when they were engaged in the most laborious part of their employment, or were tending the fire on the altar; and partly, because in the visionary appearance of Christ in the priest's habit, referred to before, he is said to be "girt about the paps with a golden girdle:" an expression which renders it unlikely that the greater part of his body was swathed with it; rather intimating, that it was tied once or twice about the breast. Josephus informs us,§ that it was tied in a knot before, the ends of it hanging down for ornament to the feet; but that when the priest was about any work, which obliged him to stoop, and the ends of the girdle would be in his way, he threw them over his left shoulder. Maimonides makes the breadth of the girdle to be three fingers,‖ Josephus four;

* Vid. Braun. de Vestitu Sacerd. Hebr. lib. i. cap. ii. sect. iii. p. 23—25, edit. Amstel. 1680; alias, sect. xvii.—xix. p. 17—19, edit. 1701; cap. vi. sect. viii. p. 131—134, edit. 1680; sect. xcii. xciii. p. 101—103, edit. 1701; cap. vii. sect. i.—iv. p. 137—141, edit. 1680; sect. xcv.—xcviii. p. 105—109, edit. 1701.

† Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vii. sect. ii. tom. i. p. 140, edit. Haverc.

‡ De Apparatu Templi, cap. viii. sect. xix. apud Crenii Fascicul. Sextum, p. 146, 147.

§ Antiq. ubi supra. ‖ Maimon. ubi supra.

and he adds, that it was wove hollow, like a snake's skin, and so served for a purse, as well as a girdle;* to which use, indeed, in ancient times girdles were commonly applied both among the Jews and Romans. Hence Horace saith, "Ibit eò, quo vis, qui zonam perdidit."† And "zonam perdere" is a Latin phrase for being a bankrupt. And hence also, when our Saviour sent out his disciples to preach, he enjoined them to "provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass, εις τας ζωνας, in their purses," or girdles; Matt. x. 9.

The fourth garment was מגבעות *migbangnoth*, the bonnet, or bonnets, as we render the word, Exod. xxviii. 40. It was also made of the שש *shèsh*, or fine twined linen; Exod. xxxix. 28. The Scripture is wholly silent, both as to the fashion of it, and the quantity of linen that composed it. According to the rabbies' description of it, it was much like the Turkish turban: they say, it consisted of a slip of linen sixteen ells long, wound round the head.‡ Josephus saith, it was like a helmet made of linen, one wreath being plaited and folded over another, and a thin cap, suited to the shape of it, put over all, to prevent its unfolding or growing slack.§

The high-priest's head dress is indeed expressed by another word, which we render a mitre; but the Jews reckon the mitre and the bonnet to be the same, only folded up in a somewhat different manner, according to the dignity of the person that wore it. They describe the mitre, as wound into a broader and more beautiful form, like the Turkish turban; whereas the bonnet was made into a more conical figure, though not into a point like the Persian turban; and this is what Josephus means, when he calls the bonnet ακωνον.‖

The sacerdotal vestments, peculiar to the high-priest, were the robe, the ephod, the breastplate, and the holy crown. These are commonly called the *vestes aureæ*, to distinguish

* Joseph. ubi supra. † Epistolarum, lib. ii. epist. ii. l. 40.

‡ Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, cap. viii. sect. ii. et xix. p. 140, 141, et 146, apud Crenii Fascicul. Sext. Vid. Braunium de Vestitu Sacerd. lib. ii. cap. iv. sect. xi. xii. p. 512, 513, edit. 1680; sect. ccclxxxviii. ccclxxxix. p. 414, 415, edit. 1701.

§ Ubi supra.

‖ Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vii. sect. iii. tom. i. p. 141, edit. Haverc. Vid. Braunium de Vestitu Sacerd. lib. ii. cap. iv. sect. xiv. xv. edit. 1680; sect. cccxci. cccxcii. p. 418, et seq. edit. 1701.

them from the plain or linen garments,* already described; for they were richly ornamented with gold and jewels.

The first was the מעיל *mengnil*, or blue robe, which was wore over the linen vest. We have the description of it in the book of Exodus: "And thou shalt make the robe of the ephod all of blue, and there shall be an hole in the top of it, in the midst thereof; it shall have a binding of woven work, round about the hole of it, as it were the hole of an habergeon, that it be not rent. And beneath, upon the hem of it, thou shalt make pomegranates of blue, and of purple, and of scarlet, round about the hem thereof, and bells of gold between them round about; a golden bell and a pomegranate, a golden bell and a pomegranate, upon the hem of the robe round about," Exod. xxviii. 31—34. It is called the robe of the ephod, not only because it was wore along with, and next under it, but because, says Maimonides, it was girded with the ephod;† that is, the girdle of the ephod served for this robe as well as for the ephod itself, and bound these two garments, together, to the body. It is not certain of what stuff this robe was made; but as it was coloured, it is not probable it was linen; because that takes the dye the worst of any sort of stuff of which garments are made. Some, therefore, will have it to be made of wool, others of cotton: the Syriac version, and after it the old Flemish, make it to be yellow silk. But as to the colour, though we are not very certain of the meaning of the Hebrew word תכלת *techeleth*, yet it seems reasonable to follow the Septuagint, which renders it hyacinth; and so does the Chaldee Paraphrase. What occasions the uncertainty in this case is, that there is both a stone and a flower called the hyacinth; the stone yellow, and the flower blue. But considering that the ephod, which was wore over the upper part of this robe, was embroidered with scarlet and gold, and that golden bells hung at the bottom of the robe itself, it is more likely that the colour was that of the hyacinth flower than that of the stone, since the gold and scarlet would show to more advantage on blue than on yellow; and therefore, we translate the word תכלת *techeleth*, blue.

* Maimon de Apparatu Templi, cap. viii. ab init.

† Ubi supra, cap. x. sect. iii. p. 154, Crenii Fascic. Sext.

Round the bottom of this robe, in the manner of a fringe, there were little golden bells, and balls of blue, purple, and scarlet, in the shape of pomegranates, which hung interchangeably. We are not informed in the Scripture of the number or size either of the bells or pomegranates. But the rabbies, who are not content to be supposed ignorant of any thing, have supplied both these defects; assuring us, that the number of each was just seventy-two,* the number of the elders of Israel; and that each pomegranate was as large as an egg.† Now since the bells, in order to their making a becoming and graceful appearance, must be supposed to be as large as the pomegranates, and likewise allowing a proper space between each bell and pomegranate, for the sounding of the bells, one cannot well admit less room than a nail of a yard, or two inches and a quarter, for each; which, multiplied by the whole number of bells and pomegranates, amounts to one hundred forty-four nails, or nine yards: an incredible circumference indeed, about double the size of a modern hoop petticoat!

This robe is said by Josephus,‡ and the rabbies,§ to be without sleeves, having a hole on each side, to put the arms through. Moses describes it as having a hole at the top, to put the head through; and saith, that this hole had a strong binding round it, to prevent its being rent, in putting it on and off; Exod. xxviii. 32.

This hole in the top of the robe is expressed in the Hebrew by פי ראשו *phi-roshu*, the mouth of his head; or through which the priest put his head; or by פי-המעיל *phi-hammengnil*, the mouth, or hole, of the robe; Exod. xxxix. 23. This will explain what is meant by the Psalmist, when he describes the precious ointment, that was poured on Aaron's head, as running down "to the skirts of his garment," פי-מדותיו *phi-middothaiv*, Psalm cxxxiii. 2; the mouth, or collar of his robe; as our translators have rendered the word *phi* in another place,

* Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, cap. iv. p. 148, Crenii Fascic. Sexti.

† R. S. Jarchi ad Exod. xxviii. 31; vid. ejus verba apud Braun. de Vestit. Sacerd. lib. ii. cap. v. sect. xviii. p. 565, 566, edit. 1680; sect. ccccxxii. p. 453, edit. 1701.

‡ This is undoubtedly the meaning of the following words in Josephus; και οθεν αι χειρες διειργονται, σχιστος εστιν, etiam aperta est, qua manus exseruntur. Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vii. sect. iv. tom. i. p. 142, edit. Haverc.

§ Maimon. ubi supra, sect. iii.

Job. xxx. 18, and Ainsworth in this; agreeable to which is Bishop Patrick's paraphrase. I can see no foundation, therefore, for that very disagreeable idea, suggested by the generality of our metrical translators, not excepting even the ingenious Dr. Watts; that the oil was poured in so profuse a quantity on Aaron's head, as to descend, not only upon his beard, but to the bottom of his clothes; which, indeed, it is not probable God would have directed to be made in so expensive and beautiful a manner, if they had been designed to be smeared with oil, and thereby to be utterly spoiled.

I take the case to be, that the hair of his head and beard was to be well anointed to the extremity, which probably reached as low as the collar of his robe. This was graceful and ornamental, according to the fashion of that country, and those times. Hence we read, not only of "wine that maketh glad the heart of man, but of oil to make his face to shine," Psalm civ. 15, or his outside; for so פנים *panim* frequently signifies, in opposition to his heart: referring probably to the anointing the hair, which was then the fashion. Hence it is, likewise, that David, among other expressions of the plenty and glory of the state, to which God had advanced him, particularly mentions his anointing his head with oil, Psalm xxiii. 5. It was a mark of the gaiety and luxury of men of pleasure, that they "anointed themselves with the chief ointments," Amos vi. 6. The same custom continued to our Saviour's time, as is evident from a certain woman's pouring the precious ointment on his head, when he was entertained at the house of Simon the leper, Matt. xxvi. 7; and from the gentle reproof which our Lord gave Simon the Pharisee, on an occasion of the like nature, for omitting that common act of civility; Luke vii. 46. On the whole, beside the mystical intention of the sacerdotal unction, it was designed, as the garments themselves were, "for glory and for beauty," Exod. xxviii. 2; which it could not have been, if they had been thereby daubed and spoiled.

It may perhaps be objected, that if these beautiful vestments were not defaced by the anointing, they must, however, have been grievously defiled with the sprinkling of blood and oil upon them, which was one ceremony prescribed and observed at the consecration of the high-priest; Exod. xxix. 21.

But as to this, let it be remarked, that the English word sprinkle is used by our translators for two Hebrew words, זרק *zarak*, and נזה *nazah*, as different from each other in sense as they are in sound. The former denotes sprinkling in a large quantity; as when Moses is commanded to take "handfuls of the ashes of the furnace, and sprinkle them toward heaven," Exod. ix. 8; and when, in Ezekiel's vision, the man clothed in linen is ordered to "fill his hand with coals of fire, and scatter, or sprinkle, them over the city;" Ezek. x. 2. Again, this word is applied to such a sprinkling, or rather pouring of clean water as should cleanse the persons on whom it was poured from all their filthiness, Ezek. xxxvi. 25; which seems to imply a considerable quantity. It is the word used for sprinkling the blood of the sacrifices round about upon the altar, Lev. vii. 2; Exod. xxix. 16; which implies, that no inconsiderable proportion of it was disposed of in that manner, which was afterward dried and consumed by the fire.

The other word נזה *nazah*, is used for sprinkling in a small quantity; as when a man dips the end of his finger in some liquor, and with that sprinkles a drop or two upon any thing. Thus, in performing the rites of cleansing a leper, the priest is ordered to pour oil into the palm of his left hand, and to sprinkle some of it with his right finger; Lev. xiv. 26, 27. Again, "the priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and sprinkle seven times before the Lord;" Lev. iv. 6. In the same manner was the high-priest to sprinkle the blood of the sacrificed bullock upon the mercy-seat; Lev. xvi. 14. It is not surely to be imagined, that he was to throw any considerable quantity of blood upon it, to defile and deface that beautiful piece of carving, and the curious images of the cherubim. He was only, with the tip of his finger, just to spot it seven times, and probably in a part where it could be easily wiped off. Now, this is the word used for the sprinkling of Aaron's garments; which, I think, may be considered as the setting God's mark upon them, perhaps by a spot in one particular place; which would no more deface their beauty, than one black letter would sully a clean cambric handkerchief.

But to return to the מעיל *mengnil*, or blue robe, which was put on over the head, and covered the body all round; but

how low it reached the Scripture no where informs us. The Septuagint calls it ὑποδυτην ποδηρη, and Josephus ποδηρης;* which means, that it reached down to the feet. But the length which we commonly see expressed in the pictures of the high-priest, to about the middle of the leg, is probably the true one; because, otherwise, the *tunica ocellata* would have been quite hid by it. Besides, this would be more convenient for the sounding of the bells which hung on the bottom of it, than if it came quite down to the feet.

The second of the *aureæ vestes* was the ephod, so called from אפד *aphad, amicivit* or *accinxit;* which verb we render to gird and to bind, in the only two places wherein it occurs: Exod. xxix. 5; Lev. viii. 7. Ephod seems to have been the name of an upper garment which was worn by persons of distinction of various characters. We read that king David, 2 Sam. vi. 4, and the eighty-five priests who were murdered by Saul, 1 Sam. xxii. 18, and even Samuel, when a child, 1 Sam. ii. 18, were girded with a linen ephod. It is therefore probable, that the peculiarity of the high-priest's ephod did not consist in its being of a different shape from that which was worn by other persons; but in the richness of the materials of which it was made, and the fine embroidery and jewels with which it was adorned. Insomuch that it might properly be called the ephod, κατ' εξοχην.

The description of this garment in the book of Exodus, relates only to its materials, and not to its shape or form. It was made "of gold, of blue, and of purple, of scarlet, and fine twined linen with cunning work;" Exod. xxviii. 6, &c. We are not very certain concerning the nature of these colours. I have already given some account of the word תכלת *techeleth,* which we render blue. As for the ארגמן *argaman,* or purple, as it is rendered, it is generally thought to be a dye made of the blood of a shell-fish of that name, which was taken on the coast of Palestine, and for which the Tyrians afterward became famous.†

Some Jewish etymologists make ארגמן *argaman,* to be a kind of adjective of the word רגם *regem,* which, according to them, signifies a prince or a royal person; wherefore they

* Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vii. sect. iv. tom. i. p. 142, edit. Haverc.

† Vid. Bochart. Hieroz. part ii. lib. v. cap. x. and xi.

would translate it a princely colour, or such as kings wore themselves, and bestowed on their greatest favourites. Thus Daniel was clothed with purple by Belshazzar, Dan. v. 29.

As for the shape of the ephod, the Septuagint calls it επωμις,* which signifies that it was worn on the shoulders. Josephus saith, it was a cubit long.† St. Jerome compares it to the Roman caracalla, which was a sort of short cloak, only that it had a head or hood to it, something like the capuchins the ladies now wear, which the ephod had not.‡ Maimonides saith, it reached down to the feet; which some suppose to be true of the back, though not of the forepart. It consisted, they imagine, of two parts, the one an oblong, rectangular piece, hanging down behind from the shoulders to the feet; and the rabbies say, it was the breadth of his back who wore it from shoulder to shoulder; the other a short rectangular piece, which hung down before, the length of a cubit. These two pieces were joined together, upon the shoulders, with some proper fastening, as loops, buttons, or the like.§

The high-priest's ephod had a very rich button upon each shoulder, made of a large onyx stone set in gold; so large that the names of the twelve tribes of Israel were engraven, six upon each stone; Exod. xxviii. 9—12.

The word שהם *shoham*, which we render onyx, the Septuagint translates σμαραγδος, an emerald. But we have no certain knowledge, either of this, or of any of the twelve stones of the breast-plate, and may as well be satisfied with our translation as with any other.‖

To the ephod there belonged a curious girdle, of the same rich fabric with the ephod itself. This is said to be "upon the ephod," Exod. xxviii. 8; that is, wove with it, as Maimonides understands it; and coming out from it on each side,

* And so Josephus, Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vii. sect. vi. Oper. tom. i. p. 150.

† Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vii. sect. v. p. 143, edit. Haverc.

‡ Hieron. ad. Fabiolam, epist. cxxviii.

§ Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, cap. ix. sect. ix. p. 150, Crenii Fascicul. Sext.

‖ Braunius hath considered the subject at large, de Vestitu Sacerd. Hebræor. lib. ii. à cap. viii. ad xix. inclusivè p. 497—588, edit. 1701. See likewise Epiphanius de xii Gemmis; Buxtorf the Younger, in his Exercitat. de Arca Fœderis; and Christ. Cartwright. Elect. Targum. Rabbin. in loc.

it was brought under the arms like a sash, and tied upon the breast.* Upon the ephod was put,

3dly. The חשן משפט *choshen mishpat*, "the breast-plate of judgment," Exod. xxviii. 15; so called, because the high-priest always wore it when he consulted the oracle, by which were determined all doubtful cases of national importance. The breast-plate was made of the same rich materials with the ephod, two spans long, and one broad; but, folding up double, it was a span square, ver. 16.† The breast-plate was fastened upon the ephod by rings of gold at the four corners, the two upper rings being hung upon or fastened to the shoulder-pieces with golden chains, and the two lower rings tied to the girdle of the ephod with blue strings or ribands; Exod. xxviii. 22—28. The breast-plate was adorned with four rows of jewels set in sockets of gold, three jewels in a row; that is, in three perpendicular rows, and four horizontal. Upon these jewels were graven the names of the twelve patriarchs, one name upon each jewel; Exod. xxviii. 17—21. If our translators have given us the right names of these stones, some of them are so hard (as particularly the diamond), that we might well wonder how they engraved them. But here the talmudists wonderfully help us, by assuring us, that they were not engraven with any tool, which would have wasted some of the substance of these precious stones, but by a miraculous worm, not now in being, which, being set upon each of these stones, crept and sunk itself along those places which Moses had marked out to it, and so impressed the letters upon the stones, as if it had been on soft wax, without taking off any part of it.‡ But as we do not pretend to know what, or how hard these stones were, we stand in no need of this miraculous worm to account for the difficulty of engraving them.

The fourth garment, or rather ornament, peculiar to the high-priest, was the plate, or crown of gold, which he wore upon the front of his mitre; Exod. xxviii. 36—38. This is

* Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, ubi supra, et sect. xi. p. 152.

† A span is half a cubit, as appears from Ezek. xliii. 13. 17, where in one verse it is said, that the border of the altar shall be a span; in the other, that it shall be half a cubit.

‡ Braun. de Vestitu Sacerdot. lib. ii. cap. vii. sect. ccccIxvii. p. 490, edit. 1701.

likewise called "the holy crown," Exod. xxxix. 6; and the plate of the holy crown; Exod. xxxix. 30. The Hebrew word ציץ *tsits*, which we translate a plate, properly signifies a flower. The Septuagint renders it πεταλον, which signifies a leaf, because, saith Ainsworth, it appeared fair and glorious. Or rather, perhaps, it is expressed by a word which signifies a flower or leaf, because it is thin, that so it might not be burdensome to wear. However, we must not conceive it to be near so thin as our leaf gold, because it had letters engraven upon it, which leaf gold will not admit of. The size and form of this plate or crown, are not expressed by Moses; but, if the Jewish doctors are worthy of credit, it was two fingers broad, and made in a circular form, suited to the shape of the head; and so long, that it reached from ear to ear, and was fastened upon a blue lace or riband, which was tied behind the head;* and as this gold plate reached but about half round the head, the remaining part of the riband, which was not covered with it, as far as to the tying, was richly ornamented with artificial flowers of embroidered work. This plate had the following motto engraved on it, קדש-ליהוה *kodhesh laihovah*, which is rendered in our translation, agreeable to most of the ancient versions, "Holiness to the Lord." The manner of engraving this motto, is said to be "like the engraving of a signet." But whether that is to be understood that the letters were sunk as in a seal, or protuberant as in the impression; as also, whether the two words were wrote in one line or two, are points which the Jewish doctors must be left to dispute and determine among themselves.

It has been customary in other nations, as Braunius shows,† to write inscriptions on the crown of princes and heroes, to which there seems to be an allusion in that passage of the Revelation, where antichrist is described as a lewd woman, with an inscription on her forehead: "Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots, and the abominations of the earth;" Rev. xvii. 5. However, I imagine the reference in this place is more especially to the Jewish high-priest, and to the

* Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, cap. ix. sect. i. p. 147, Crenii Fasciculi Sect.; et R. S. Jarchi in loc.

† De Vestitu Sacerd. Hebræor. lib. ii. cap. xxii. sect. xv. edit. Amstel. 1680; sect. dclxx. p. 636, edit. 1701.

inscription on his crown; because this woman immediately before is said to be "arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones," which were the colours and ornaments of his *vestes aureæ*, or golden vestments. The description seems, therefore, to intimate, that the person was one who would assume the character of Pontifex Maximus. How applicable this is to the Pope, every one may perceive, who is not greatly prejudiced; especially as the word *Mysterium* was formerly engraven on the papal crown. But when the Protestants began to remark its congruity to the forecited passage in the Revelation, Pope Julius the Third ordered a new crown to be made, on which, instead of the former motto, was engraven, *Julius, Pontifex Maximus.**

Josephus gives us the description of a more pompous crown, which, in his time, the high-priests wore over their mitre, on which was embossed the calyx, or cup of a flower, resembling that produced by a plant which the Greeks call υοσκυαμος.† But since, according to the original institution, this was no part of the pontifical dress, it does not belong to our province particularly to consider it. Possibly this might be the crown which Alexander the Great presented to Jaddua, when he went out to meet him, and which was afterward worn on grand and solemn occasions, in like manner as persons wear medals presented to them by princes, as badges of honour.

Thus have we considered the pontifical *vestes aureæ*. To these, particularly to the breast-plate, belonged the Urim and Thummim: "Thou shalt put in the breast-plate of judgment, the Urim and the Thummim; and they shall be upon Aaron's heart, when he goeth in before the Lord; and Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the Lord continually;" Exod. xxviii. 30. The words אורים and תמים *Urim* and *Thummim* signify lights and perfections. The Septuagint renders them δηλωσιν and αληθειαν, manifestation and truth. But what they mean, as applied to the pontifical breast-plate, is not easily ascertained. Moses having said little concerning them, hath left room for innumerable conjectures, wherewith many pages, and whole volumes,

* See Poli Synops. in loc.

† Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vii. sect. vii. tom. i. p. 154, edit. Haverc.

of later writers have been filled. And, after all, nothing is more pertinent than the following sentence of Rabbi Kimchi: "He is on the safest side," saith he, "who frankly confesses his ignorance: so that we seem to need a priest to stand up with Urim and Thummim, to teach us what the Thummim were," alluding to Ezra ii. 63.

We read of no commandment, or direction, given to Moses for the making of them; he is only ordered to put them in the breast-plate: "Thou shalt put in the breast-plate of judgment the Urim and the Thummim;" Exod. xxviii. 30. There is no mention of them in the account of the making of Aaron's garments in the thirty-ninth chapter of Exodus; only in that of clothing the high-priest in Leviticus, it is said, "He put the breast-plate upon him, also he put in the breast-plate the Urim and Thummim." From hence some of the Hebrew doctors conclude, they were not the work of any human artificer, but of God himself.* The use of them was to inquire of God, and to receive an answer by them concerning his will. It is said, in the book of Numbers, that Eleazar the priest shall ask counsel for Joshua after the judgment of Urim before the Lord; Numb. xxvii. 21. And when Saul "inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by the prophets;" 1 Sam. xxviii. 6. And when Moses blessed the tribes of Israel, of Levi he said, "Let thy Urim and Thummim be with thy Holy One;" Deut. xxxiii. 8. The opinion concerning the Urim and Thummim, most generally received among the Jews, is, that they were the twelve precious stones in the breast-plate, on which were engraven the names of the twelve tribes of Israel; and that the oracle gave its answer to any question proposed, by causing such letters in them to shine with a superior lustre, or to appear prominent above the rest, as formed the words of the answer; which, some say, the high-priest was by inspiration taught to spell, and dispose in their proper order; though others maintain the several letters shone or appeared prominent, not all together, but one after another, in the order which formed the words of the answer.† And whereas all the letters of the

* Rabbi Bechai, quoted by Schickard, Jure Regio, cap. i. theor. ii. p. 19, 20, edit. Carpzov.

† Vid. Schickard. de Jure Regio, cap. i. theor. ii. p. 24, edit. Carpzov. But

alphabet are not found in the names of the twelve tribes, the talmudists inform us, that the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were likewise engraven over the name of Reuben; and under that of Benjamin, the words שבטי יה *shibhte-Jah*, "the tribes of the Lord;" and by this means the alphabet was completed. Josephus, and some others, imagine the answer was returned by the stones of the breast-plate appearing with an unusual lustre, when it was favourable, or, in the contrary case, dim.* Others suppose the Urim and Thummim were something inclosed between the folding or doubling of the breast-plate; which, they say, was doubled for that very purpose, that it might be fit, as a purse, to contain them. What they were, is, however, differently conjectured. Some of the rabbies will have them to be the Tetragrammaton, or the word יהוה *Jehovah*, which, they say, was wrote in a mysterious manner in two parts, and two different ways.† Christophorus de Castro, and after him Dr. Spencer,‡ maintain them to be two little images, shut up in the doubling of the breast-plate, which gave the oracular answer from thence by an articulate voice. They accordingly derive them from the Egyptians, who consulted their Lares, and had an oracle, or Teraphim, which they called Truth: which, however, it is more likely they borrowed from the Jews, than the Jews from them.

This conceit of Dr. Spencer's has been so abundantly confuted by Dr. Pocock,§ that it does not appear to have been

Scheringham, on the Mishnical book Joma, cap. viii. sect. v. not. xi. p. 251, 252, saith, that Schickard was mistaken in supposing it the opinion of the rabbies, that the letters shone, or became prominent, in the order which composed the words of the answer; but that their notion was, that by an audible divine voice pronouncing the words, the high-priest was prevented from mistaking either the order of the letters, which were, or the points which were not engraven on the breast-plate. See likewise Carpzov. ad Schickard.

* Antiq. lib. iii. cap. viii. sect. ix. Op. tom. i. p. 164.

† Vid. R. Solomon. et Targum Jonathan. citat. à Schickard. Jure Regio, cap. i. theor. ii. p. 20, 21.

‡ Vid. Dissert. de Urim et Thummim.

§ Comment. on Hosea, chap. iii. 4; see likewise Witsius's Egyptiaca, in the first book and eighth chapter of which learned performance he hath given an account of Spencer's hypothesis, and in the second book, the third, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth chapters, a distinct and accurate confutation of it.

adopted by any since his time. The more common opinion among Christians concerning the oracle by Urim and Thummim, and which Dr. Prideaux espouses,* is, that when the high-priest appeared before the veil, clothed with his ephod and breast-plate, to ask counsel of God, the answer was given by an audible voice from the mercy-seat within the veil: which, he thinks, best answers to the Scripture expression of "inquiring at the mouth of the Lord," Josh. ix. 14; and God's "communing" and talking with those who consulted him; Exod. xxv. 22. But this account will by no means agree with the history of David's consulting the oracle by Abiathar: when he knew "Saul secretly practised mischief against him, he said to Abiathar the priest, Bring hither the ephod;" and then he inquired of the Lord, "Will the men of Keilah deliver me up into his hands?" 1 Sam. xxiii. 9—11. And on another occasion, "I pray thee," said he to Abiathar, "bring me hither the ephod: and he brought the ephod: and David inquired at the Lord, Shall I pursue after this troop?" &c., chap. xxx. 7, 8. On both the occasions, the ephod being used in consulting the oracle, it is concluded the answer was given by Urim: and that could not be by a voice from the mercy-seat upon the ark, the ark being then at Kirjath-jearim, a city in the tribe of Judah, 1 Sam. vii. 1, 2: whereas David and Abiathar were in the forest of Hareth the first time of consulting the oracle, 1 Sam. xxii. 5; and at Ziklag, in the country of the Philistines, the second, chap. xxix. 11, and xxx. 1.

I will only mention one opinion more on this subject, that which is espoused and supported by the learned Braunius. He supposes, that when Moses is commanded to put in the breast-plate the Urim and Thummim, which words are in the plural number, and signify lights and perfections, it means only that he should make choice of the most perfect set of stones, and have them so polished as to give the brightest and finest lustre.† This is likewise the notion of Hottinger.‡ And on this supposition, the use and design of the Urim and

* See his Connect. part i. book iii. sub anno 535 ante Christ.

† See the reasons with which he supports this opinion, in his treatise De Vestitu Sacerd. Hebræor. lib. ii. cap. xx. sect. xviii.—xxi. p. 786—773, Amstel. 1680; sect. dcxxxi.—dcxxxv. p. 605—610, edit. 1701.

‡ Vid. Hotting. annot. in Godw. Mosen et Aaron. lib. i. cap. v. not. 11.

Thummim, or of these exquisitely polished jewels in the pectoral, was only to be a symbol of the Divine presence, and of the light and perfection of the prophetic inspiration; and, as such, constantly to be worn by the high-priest in the exercise of his sacred function, especially in consulting the oracle.*

Amidst this great variety of sentiments, we may indulge this consolatory reflection, that if a more clear and certain knowledge of this subject had been necessary or useful, the Scripture account, beyond all question, would have been more distinct and particular.†

Having described the sacerdotal vestments; it only remains that I add a few general remarks concerning them.

1st. The priests wore these garments only when they officiated; at other times it does not appear they were distinguished by their habits from other men.‡ It is said, these vestments "shall be upon Aaron and upon his sons, when they come in unto the tabernacle of the congregation, or when they come near unto the altar to minister in the holy place;" Exod. xxviii. 43. And again, they are styled "the clothes of service, to do service in the holy place; and the holy garments for Aaron the priest, and his sons' garments, to minister in the priest's office;" chap. xxxix. 41. Accordingly, Josephus, speaking of the priests, saith, they were habited like the common people; adding, he only who ministers wears the sacred vestments.§ It is reasonably supposed, that some of the "chambers built round about against the wall of the temple," 1 Kings vi. 5, were vestries, in which the priests dressed for their ministry, and laid up the sacred vestments when the service was over. This is conformed by the following passage in Ezekiel's vision

* Braun. de Vestitu, ubi supra, sect. xxv.—xxvii. p. 778—782, edit. Amstel. 1680; sect. dcxl.—dcxliii. p. 613—617, edit. 1701.

† See on this subject Lightfoot's Handful of Gleanings upon Exod. sect. xlviii.; Buxtorf, in his Exercitat. de Arca Fœderis; Schickard. Jus Regium Hebræor. cum annot. Carpzov. cap. i. theor. iii. p. 17—46; and Sheringham in Joma apud Mishna Surenhusii, cap. viii. sect. v. not. xi. tom. ii. p. 251, 252.

‡ Vid. Selden. de Success. in Pontif. lib. ii. cap. vii. Oper. vol. ii. p. 183, præsertim de Synedr. lib. iii. cap. ii. sect. iii. Op. vol. i. tom. ii. p. 1689—1711.

§ Vid. Joseph. de Bell. Jud. lib. v. cap. v. sect. vii.; and Selden's observations on the passage, in his Treatise de Synedr. ubi supra, p. 1711.

of the temple and the holy service: "When they go forth into the outer court, even into the court of the people, they shall put off their garments, wherein they ministered, and lay them in the holy chambers; and they shall put on other garments;" Ezek. xliv. 19. This remark, perhaps, may furnish us with the best account of Paul's not knowing the high-priest, Ananias, when he appeared before him in the Sanhedrim, Acts xxiii. 5; because, being not engaged in any duty of his ministerial function, he had not on his pontifical robes, nor was distinguished by any particular habit; and as in those times the high-priest was often changed by the Roman power, so as rather to have become an annual officer, than, as he ought to have been according to the law of Moses, one for life, and as Paul was now grown a stranger at Jerusalem, it is very probable he might never have seen him before; or, if he had, in his pontifical robes in the temple, where he had lately attended for seven days successively, Acts xxi. 27, he might not have taken such particular notice of his person, as readily to know him again in another place and another dress. This I take to be an easier solution than to render ουκ ηδειν (as some do), "I acknowledge him not to be high-priest," on account of his procuring the office by corruption and bribery; or to suppose, with Dr. Whitby, that the same prophetic impulse which had moved him to utter that prophecy against him, "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall," Acts xxiii. 3, did not suffer him to consider, just at that time, that it was the high-priest to whom he spoke.

Godwin saith, the high-priest might not wear his sacred garments abroad in the city, unless on some urgent occasion; as when Simeon the Just went forth to meet Alexander. But his name, according to Josephus, was not Simeon the Just, but Jaddua,* his grandfather.†

2dly. The sacerdotal vestments were provided at the expense, not of the priests, but of the people.‡ As for the

* Antiq. lib. xi. cap. viii. sect. iv. v. tom. i. p. 580—582; see also an account of the affair in Prideaux's Connect. part i. book vii. sub anno 332 ante Christ.

† Compare Joseph. Antiq. ubi supra, sect. vii. p. 582, with lib. xii. cap. ii. sect. iv. p. 589.

‡ Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, cap. viii. sect. vii. p. 142, Crenii Fascic. Sext.

pontifical *vestes aureæ*, which were exceeding rich and costly, they are supposed to have been provided out of the public treasury; and the other sacerdotal garments, either the same way, or by free-will offerings. We are told, Ezra ii. 68, 69, that when some of the chief of the fathers came to see the temple, which was rebuilding after the captivity, they gave according to their ability unto the treasure of the work, not only gold and silver, but a hundred priests' garments. Again, the Tirshatha (or Nehemiah the governor) gave to the treasury (beside gold and silver there mentioned), five hundred and thirty priests' garments, Nehem. vii. 70; and the rest of the people gave sixty-seven, ver. 72.

The Talmudists and Maimonides say, that all free-will offerings of that sort must be given to the whole congregation, that is, to the officers who managed its concerns; insomuch that if the mother of a priest brought her son a garment, it was to be given, not to him, but to them,* and they might assign the use of it to whom they pleased. Indeed, it does not seem likely the sacerdotal garments should be the property of particular priests, and worn by them only; especially when the priests were divided, as they were in David's time, into twenty-four courses, and each inferior priest officiated at the temple only a fortnight in a year. They were designed therefore for the common use of the priests, as they came in their turns to minister.

3dly. The rabbies say, that when the garments of the inferior priests were grown foul, they were not washed, but cut into shreds, to make wicks for the lamps of the sanctuary; and when the high-priest's vestments were left off, they were put to no farther use, but hid in some secret place.† But of this the Scripture says nothing.

4thly. You will observe, that neither the high-priest, nor those of the lower order, wore any thing, either on their hands or feet, while they were employed in their ministry. There is no garment assigned to either in any Scripture cata-

* Gemar. Hierosolym. tit. Shek. cap. iv.; see this, and a quotation from the Babylonian Gemara, and from Maimonides, in Braunius de Vestitu, lib. ii. cap. xxiv. sect. xv. p. 839, edit. Amstel. 1680; cap. xxv. sect. dccviii. p. 667, edit. 1701.

† Vid. Braun. ubi supra, cap. xxv. sect. xi. p. 858—861, edit. Amstel. 1680; cap. xxvi. sect. dcexx. p. 682, 683, edit. 1701.

logue. The sacrificial services, in which the priests were chiefly employed, would not conveniently admit of their wearing gloves; and in public worship, to be barefoot seems to have been reckoned a token of reverence even before the giving of the law: for when God appeared to Moses in the bush, he commanded him to "put his shoes from off his feet, because the place whereon he stood was holy ground;" Exod. iii. 5. In those days this was a usual token of reverence during divine worship, when men considered themselves as in the more immediate presence of God. It was fit, therefore, Moses should express the same kind of religious veneration in a place which God, by manifesting himself in so extraordinary a manner, was pleased to render, *pro tempore*, a temple or holy place. For the same reason, Joshua is commanded to pay the like homage before the "captain of the host of the Lord," Josh. v. 15, who was undoubtedly "the angel of God's presence, in whom his name is," even the divine Λογος; for it is said, Joshua "fell on his face to the earth, and worshipped him;" ver. 14. This we cannot suppose he would have done if he had esteemed him only a created angel; or that, if he had done it, his worship would not have met with such a rebuke as the angel gave to St. John,—"See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow servant: worship God;" Rev. xxii. 9. The Jewish priests, according to the rabbies, were required to be superstitiously exact in this ceremony; for if any thing intervened between their feet and the ground, they imagined their ministry would be null and invalid.*

It may not be improper here to remark, that as the Jews accounted it a token of reverence to have their feet bare in public worship, so likewise to have their heads covered. This was accordingly the practice, not only of the priests but of the people, as at this day it is, in token of their modesty and humility, and of their accounting themselves unworthy to look up in the more immediate presence of God. Thus, on the Divine appearance to Moses in the bush, it is said, "he hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God;" Exod. iii. 6. And on the extraordinary manifestation of the Divine presence

* Vid. Mish. tit. Zebhac. cap. ii. sect. i.; R. Bartenor. et Maimon. in loc. tom. v. p. 10, edit. Surenhus.; et Maimon. de Ratione adeundi Templi, cap. v. sect. xvii. xix. p. 202, 203, Crenii Fasciculi Sexti.

to Elijah, he "wrapped his face in his mantle;" 1 Kings xix. 13. On the same account, perhaps, the angels were represented in vision to Isaiah, as covering their faces with their wings in the presence of Jehovah, Isa. vi. 2; to have the head uncovered, being esteemed a mark of confidence. For which reason, in those places where the Israelites are said to have "marched out of Egypt with a high hand," the Chaldee Paraphrast renders it "bareheaded," that is, with boldness and intrepidity.

The ancient Romans, likewise, performed their sacred rites with a veil or covering on their heads, as appears from these lines in Virgil:—

> Quin, ubi transmissæ steterint trans æquora classes,
> Et positis aris jam vota in littore solves;
> Purpureo velare comas adopertus amictu:
> Ne qua inter sanctos ignes in honore Deorum
> Hostilis facies occurrat, et omina turbet.
>
> Æneid, iii. l. 403, &c.

Again,

> Spes est pacis, ait. Tum numina sancta precamur
> Palladis armisonæ, quæ prima accepit ovantes:
> Et capita ante aras Phrygio velamur amictu.
>
> Ibid. l. 543, &c.

The Grecians, on the contrary, performed the sacred rites bareheaded. "Illic (nempe in æde Saturni) Græco ritu, capite aperto, res divina fit," saith Macrobius.* St. Paul, therefore, writing to the Corinthians, who were Greeks, declares, that "every man praying or prophesying, with his head covered, dishonoureth his head," 1 Cor. xi. 4; thereby teaching us, that though the circumstances of dress, as well as gesture, in divine worship, are in themselves indifferent; yet such are proper to be used, as the custom of the country where we dwell has rendered significative of humility and reverence.

5thly. The sacerdotal vestments are all supposed to have a moral and typical signification, though the more immediate design of them, especially of the pontifical *vestes aureæ*, was "for glory and for beauty;" Exod. xxviii. 2. For the whole ceremonial worship had "a shadow of good things to come,"

* Saturnal. lib. i. cap. viii. p. 222, 223, edit. Gronov. Lugd. Bat. 1670.

Heb. x. 1; and it is said of the priests in particular, that they "served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things," chap. viii. 5. Concerning the typical and spiritual meaning of these vestments, as pretty commonly represented by Christians, consult Mather's sermon on this subject in his "Types Unveiled." As for the Jews, they discover a world of philosophy in them. Josephus* makes the high-priest's linen garment represent the body of the earth; the glorious robe, heaven; the bells and pomegranates, thunder and lightning. Or otherwise, the ephod of various colours is the universe; the breast-plate, the earth in its centre; the girdle, the sea; the onyx stone on each shoulder, the sun and moon; the twelve stones in the breast-plate, the twelve signs of the zodiac, or the twelve months in the year; the mitre, heaven; and the golden plate with the name of God engraven on it, the splendour of the Divine Majesty in heaven. Philo philosophises on them in a similar manner.†

But the talmudical doctors assign them a more religious and moral signification; the eight garments denoting circumcision, which was to be performed on the eighth day; and each garment being to expiate a particular sin—the breeches, uncleanness; the girdle, theft; the ephod, idolatry; the breast-plate, perverse judgment; the bells, evil speaking; the mitre, and the golden plate on the forehead, pride and impudence.‡

The Cocceian divines, who have great talents at allegorizing, find out in them, in a manner, all spiritual blessings and graces. Braunius, in particular, makes the mitre signify wisdom; the robe, righteousness; the breeches, sanctification; and the girdle, redemption: all which "Christ is made of God unto believers;" 1 Cor. i. 30. By the other vestments are denoted the principal benefits of the gospel; election and adoption, by the ephod and the pectoral; vocation,

* Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vii. sect. ult. tom. i. p. 156, 157, edit. Haverc.

† Philo. Jud. de Somniis, apud Opera, p. 463, 464; de Vitâ Mosis, lib. iii. p. 518—521; de Monarch. lib. ii. p. 636, 637, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

‡ Vid. Braun. de Vestitu Sacerd. Hebræor. lib. ii. cap. xxvi. sect. ix. x. p. 878—881, edit. Amstel. 1680; cap. xxvii. sect. dccxlv. dccxlvi. p. 707—709, edit. 1701.

or effectual calling, by the bells; faith, by the golden crown, &c.* These divines, as well as some of the ancients, have permitted their fancies to make excursions beyond the bounds of reason and good sense. Nevertheless, those who will admit of no typical meaning in any of these things, go into a contrary extreme. It will be happy, if we can hit the just medium, in attempting which the Scripture will be our best guide.

Three rites of the consecration, both of the high-priest and the common priests, their washing, anointing, and clothing, being considered, there remains a

4th. The offering certain sacrifices according to the prescription in the book of Exodus, chap. xxix. These were a young bullock and two rams, beside unleavened bread, cakes, and wafers, ver. 1, 2; the bullock for a sin-offering, one ram for a burnt-offering, both which were entirely consumed with fire, ver. 13, 14. 18: and the other ram and the bread in the nature of a peace-offering, part only of which was consumed on the altar, and the rest eat by the priests, for whom the sacrifices were offered, ver. 19—28.

The first of these sacrifices, which was the sin-offering, was to signify, that till their sins were expiated, they were not fit to perform any acceptable service, much less to offer sacrifice, or make atonement for the sins of the people.

The second, which was the holocaust, or whole burnt-offering, was in the nature of a gift or present, whereby they were recommended to God.

The third was a peace-offering, on which they made a feast, and by that were initiated into his family.†

The ram of the peace-offering is called in the Hebrew איל מלאים *eil milluim, aries impletionum*, ver. 22: which Ainsworth renders the "ram of filling the hand;" because "the part which was to be consumed on the altar, was first put into the hands of Aaron, and into the hands of his sons," ver. 24.

Rabbi Solomon gives a different reason for the ram's being called איל מלאים *eil milluim*, from מלא *malè, plenus vel completus est;* because the offering of this sacrifice completed

* Ubi supra, sect. xvi. xvii. p. 887—889, edit. Amstel. 1680; sect. dccliii. dcclv. p. 713—715, edit. 1701.

† See Patrick on Exod. xxix. 10.

the consecration, and thereupon the priests were fully invested in their office. Accordingly, the Septuagint renders מלאים *milluim* by τελειωσις, consummation; and hence, perhaps, the apostle, speaking of Christ under the character of a priest, saith, he is εις τον αιωνα τετελειωμενος, Heb. vii. 28, consummated or perfected for ever.

Godwin takes particular notice of two circumstances in these sacrifices:—

1st. That some of the blood of the ram of consecration was put upon the tip of the right ear, and the thumb of the right hand, and the great toe of the right foot of the priests who were consecrated; Exod. xxix. 20. Probably it was put upon their ear, as denoting the attention they, especially, ought to give to God's word, that they might be thoroughly instructed in the duties of their office, and be fit to be teachers of others; for attention to the word of God, or care and diligence in learning his mind and will, is expressed by "opening the ear:" Job xxxvi. 10; Isa. l. 5.

The touching the right thumb with the same blood was to signify, that they were to attend with diligence on the work of their ministry, which is called "the work of their hands;" Deut. xxxiii. 11. This phrase is expressive of any sort of active service. It is said in the Acts, that "by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people;" though some of these were wrought only by speaking, chap. v. 5; and others, by their shadow overshadowing the diseased; ver. 15, 16.

Since the right hand only was consecrated by the sacrificial blood, the rabbies say, if a priest made use of his left, instead of his right, in performing any part of the service, it polluted it.*

The touching of the great toe with the blood is supposed to signify, that they ought to take great heed, that their conversation might be holy, without blame, and such as became the ministers of God; for the conversation is frequently expressed by walking: Psalm i. 1; xv. 2; Prov. x. 9; Isa. xxxiii. 15; Phil. iii. 17; Gal. ii. 14; and in many other places, both of the Old and New Testament. And the application of the

* Mishn. et Bartenor, et Maimon. in loc. ubi supra; Maimon. de Ratione adeundi Temple, ubi supra, sect. xviii.

sacrificial blood to all these parts of the body, was doubtless intended to denote that all must be sanctified and rendered acceptable to God by the blood of Christ.

The other circumstance which our author remarks, is, that "at the consecration of the priests, certain pieces of the sacrifices were put into their hands," as was before observed. On which account their consecration itself is expressed by "filling their hands;" Exod. xxviii. 41, ומלאת את-ידים *umillèath eth-jadham, et implebis manum eorum.* Our author from hence derives the custom in the Church of England, or, as he is pleased to express it, in the Christian church, of the bishop's giving a Bible into the hand of the minister to be ordained; "BOTH WHICH," he saith, "may signify, that no man taketh that honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron:" and adds, "contrary to this did Jeroboam's priests; whoever would, he filled his own hands," 1 Kings xiii. 33: that is, "he thrust himself into the priesthood." I hope our author did not intend this comparison to Jeroboam's priests for a reflection on all ministers not episcopally ordained according to the rites of the English establishment. However, I beg leave to observe, that the words in Kings החפץ ימלא את-ידו *hechaphets jemallè eth jadho*, should rather be rendered *ejus qui voluit implevit manum*, that is, Jeroboam filled the hand of him that would. Yet, because our king appoints to the episcopal office whom he pleases, far be it from me to compare our bishops to Jeroboam's priests.

Godwin remarks some peculiarities, by which the high-priest was distinguished from the common priests.

1st. He must marry none but a virgin; Lev. xxi. 13, 14. Therefore he was exempt from the law of marrying his brother's widow, in case he died without children; Deut. xxv. 5. Our author says, another priest may lawfully marry a widow; and Josephus says the same.* But there is no such express permission in the law; only it is inferred from a widow's not being mentioned among those whom a common priest is forbid to marry; Lev. xxi. 7. Nevertheless, Grotius is of opinion the common priests had not this liberty, unless with respect to the widows of priests. This he grounds on the following passage of Ezekiel: "Neither shall they (that is,

* Antiq. lib. iii. cap. xii. sect. ii. tom. i. p. 183, edit. Haverc.

any priests) take for their wives a widow, or her that is put away; but they shall take maidens of the seed of the house of Israel, or a widow that had a priest before;" Ezek. xliv. 22.* However, it is certain the high-priest might marry none but a virgin; and the rabbies have determined the age she must be, at the time of her marriage, within less than half a year, between twelve years old and a day, and twelve years and a half. For they observe, she must not only be a virgin בתולה *bethulah*, but he must marry her before she comes to the age of puberty, בבתוליה *bibhthuleiha*, in her virginity; which, they say, was circumscribed within the short period I have mentioned.†

We may farther observe, they are much more liberal to the king than to the priest; allowing the former eighteen wives, the latter but one; at least, if he did take another, they say, he must give a bill of divorce to one of them before the great day of expiation, otherwise he would be incapable of performing the services then required.‡

2dly. The high-priest must not mourn for the death of his nearest kindred. He "shall not uncover his head, nor rend his clothes; neither shall he go in to any dead body, nor defile himself for his father, or for his mother. Neither shall he go out of the sanctuary, nor profane the sanctuary of his God;" Lev. xxi. 10—12. The ceremonies of mourning, here prohibited, are such as would not consist with his attending the service of the sanctuary; and the reason of the law is, that the public worship of God, in which the presence and ministration of the high-priest was in many cases necessary, might not be interrupted.

The ceremonies forbidden are,

1st. Uncovering his head. The Septuagint renders ראשו לא יפרע *roshu lo jiphrang*, *την κεφαλην ουκ αποκιδαρωσει*, *caput non nudabit cidari;* or, if I may be allowed the expression, he shall not unmitre his head; a phrase which, though it is not an exact translation, does not improperly convey the true

* See Grotii Annot. ad Lev. xxi. 14.

† Vid. Selden, Uxor. Hebr. lib. ii. cap. vii. Oper. vol. ii. tom. ii. p. 555, 556.

‡ Selden, ubi supra, cap. viii. p. 561, 562.

design of the law, which was to prevent his omitting the duties of his office on occasion of the death even of his nearest relations, which he must have done if he had complied with the custom of uncovering his head, or laying aside his mitre, that being one of the holy garments, without which it was unlawful for him to officiate; Exod. xxviii. 36—38. The Chaldee Paraphrase renders the word very differently from the Septuagint: *in capite suo non nutriat comam.* Ainsworth saith the Hebrew word פרע *pharang*, signifies, both to make bare and to make free: Onkelos, it seems, taking it in the latter sense, understands the meaning of the law to be, that their hair should not be left to grow free, without trimming. In this manner, we are told by Herodotus, the Egyptians used to express their mourning for the dead;* letting the hair grow long, and in a negligent form, being considered as a mark of inattention to themselves, through excessive grief. Mephibosheth was in such deep concern for David on account of Absalom's rebellion, that "he neither trimmed his beard, nor washed his clothes, from the day the king departed from Jerusalem, until the day he came again in peace;" 2 Sam. xix. 24. If we understand the law according to the sense of Onkelos, it is either designed to prevent the high-priest's symbolizing with the Heathens, in the rites of mourning, or to preserve decency in public worship, it not being fit that the chief minister in the sanctuary should appear with his hair long and neglected, as mourners sometimes did.

However, both among the Jews and the neighbouring nations, it was a more usual sign of mourning, not only to uncover, but even to shave their heads. When Job was informed of his repeated losses, and of the death of his children, "he rent his mantle, and shaved his head;" Job i. 20. And in the prophecy of Jeremiah we read of fourscore men, who were going to lament the desolation of Jerusalem, having their beards shaven, and their clothes rent; Jer. xli. 5. That this was usual among the Persians appears from the following passage of Quintus Curtius: "Persæ, comis suo more detonsis, in lugubri veste, cum conjugibus ac liberis (Alexandrum),

* Herodot. Euterp. cap. xxxvi. p. 101, edit. Gronov. Lugd. Bat. 1715.

non ut victorem, et modo hostem, sed ut gentis suæ justissimum regem vero desiderio lugebant."* And that the same rite was in use among other nations, appears from Suetonius, in his life of Caligula, where, after observing, that on the death of Cæsar Germanicus, some barbarous nations at war among themselves and with the Romans, agreed to a cessation of hostilities, as if their grief had been of a domestic nature, and on an occasion which alike concerned them both, he adds, "Regulos quosdam (ferunt) barbam posuisse et uxorum capita rasisse, ad indicium maximi luctûs."†

We meet with frequent references to this rite of mourning in Scripture. In the prophet Jeremiah: "Cut off thy hair, O Jerusalem; take up a lamentation;" chap. vii. 29. In the prophet Micah: "Make thee bald, and poll thee for thy delicate children, for they are gone into captivity;" chap. i. 16. In Isaiah: "The Lord shall shave with a razor that is hired, namely, by them beyond the river, by the king of Assyria, the head and the hair of the feet; and it shall also consume the beard," referring to the Assyrian captivity; chap. vii. 20. And by the same prophet baldness is mentioned among the signs of mourning, chap. xxii. 12. And so by Jeremiah: "Every head shall be bald, and every beard clipt:" which is thus explained, "There shall be lamentation, generally, upon all the house-tops of Moab;" Jer. xlviii. 37, 38. And once more, "Neither shall men lament for them, nor cut themselves, nor make themselves bald for them;" chap. xvi. 6. Upon the whole, then, the prohibition of the high-priest's uncovering his head for the dead, probably means, not only that he must not appear without his mitre, but that he must not shave his head, nor yet, on the other hand, let his hair grow long and neglected. Both these extremes are expressly prohibited: "Neither shall they," that is, the priests, "shave their heads, nor suffer their locks to grow long;" Ezek. xliv. 20.

2dly. The high-priest must not rend his clothes, in token of mourning for the dead, which was anciently much practised by the Jews and other nations. Quintus Curtius saith, that

* Quint. Curt. de Gestis Alexand. lib. x. cap. v. sect. xvii. p. 785, edit. Lugd. Bat. 1696.

† In Vitâ Calig. cap. v. sect. iii. iv. tom. i. p. 768, edit. Pitisci, Traject. ad Rhen. 1690.

when Darius was on the point of being seized by Bessus and the Bactrians, in order to be delivered up to Alexander, and the only domestic left about him made such loud lamentations as alarmed the camp, "irrupere deinde alii laceratisque vestibus, lugubri et barbaro ululatu regem deplorare cœperunt."* Virgil says of Amata, that apprehending Turnus was dead,

> Se causam clamat, crimenque caputque malorum,
> Multaque per mœstum demens effata furorem,
> Purpureos moritura manu discindit amictus,
> Et nodum informis lethi trabe nectit ab altâ.
>
> Æneid, xii. l. 600—603.

And Latinus, her husband, hearing of her unhappy fate,

> ———It scissâ veste Latinus
> Conjugis attonitus fatis urbisque ruina.
>
> Ib. l. 609, 610.

So Juvenal, describing the funeral rites with which Priam would have been honoured, had he died before Paris committed the rape of Helen, saith,

> Incolumi Trojâ Priamus venisset ad umbras
> Assaraci magnis solemnibus, Hectore funus
> Portante, ac reliquis fratrum cervicibus, inter
> Iliadum lacrymas, ut primos edere planctus
> Cassandra inciperet, scissaque Polyxena palla.
>
> Satyr. x. l. 258—262.

We have this rite of mourning frequently mentioned in Scripture, as practised on various occasions, particularly on the death of relations or friends, as by Reuben and his father Jacob on the supposed death of Joseph, Gen. xxxvii. 29—34; and by David, on the death of Saul and Jonathan, 2 Sam. i. 11: sometimes it was practised on account of great injuries received, as by Tamar, when she had been abused by her brother Amnon, 2 Sam. xiii. 19; or on account of the infliction or denunciation of public judgments; for which reason it is mentioned as a sign of great stupidity in king Jehoiakim and his courtiers, that when they read, in a roll of Jeremiah's prophecy, what judgments God threatened to bring upon the nations, "they were not afraid, nor rent their garments;" Jer. xxxvi. 24. Again, it was practised when they heard

* Quint. Curt. de Gestis Alexand. Magn. lib. v. cap. x. sect. xii. p. 358, edit. Lugd. Bat. 1696.

blasphemy or any other profane contempt of God, as by king Hezekiah and his officers, when they heard the blasphemous railing of Rabshakeh; Isa. xxxvi. 22, and chap. xxxvii. 1. The rabbies indeed say, it was to be practised only on hearing blasphemy from one of their own nation, and therefore they conclude Rabshakeh was an apostate Jew.* In this way they expressed their detestation of either words or actions that were affrontive to the Deity. When, therefore, the priest and people at Lystra would have paid divine honours to Paul and Barnabas, "they rent their clothes;" Acts xiv. 14. And this Caiaphas did, when our Saviour declared himself to be the Son of God, on which account he charged him with blasphemy; Matt. xxvi. 65. Upon this a question has been started, whether he did not herein act contrary to the law in Leviticus, which, in two places, under a severe penalty, forbids the high-priest rending his clothes; Lev. x. 6, and chap. xxi. 10. Grotius observes, the occasion in both cases was the death of relations, and that there is no express prohibition which extends to any other occasion.† Besides, these were both very peculiar and extraordinary cases. The one was, the death of Nadab and Abihu by the immediate hand of God, for offering strange fire on the altar, when neither their father nor their brethren were permitted to show any sign of mourning, lest it should look like arraigning the Divine justice; and perhaps it might be intended as an additional punishment to them, that they should not only be struck dead, but die unlamented The latter prohibition, chap. xxi. 10, is in the case of the priest's daughter playing the harlot, for which she was to be burnt with fire, ver. 9; and then it follows, he, that is, the high-priest, shall not uncover his head, nor rend his clothes, because, on such an occasion, it would look like a reflection on the legislator, or on the law itself. However, if the prohibition be supposed to extend to all cases, it probably related to the sacerdotal vestments only, which were not to be rent on any occasion.‡

* In libro Præceptorum. See the passage quoted by Drusius on Matt. xxvi. 65.

† Agreeably to the Chaldee Paraphrast in loc.

‡ Selden. de Jure Natur. et Gent. lib. ii. cap. xii. Oper. vol. i. tom. i. p. 271, 272.

And so it is certain the Jews in later ages understood it; for it is said in the First Book of Maccabees, chap. xi. 71, that Jonathan the high-priest, on the defeat and flight of his army, "rent his clothes." And in Josephus we are informed, that to appease a popular commotion, excited by the cruelties of Florus, procurator of Judea, the principal persons, and particularly the high-priests, rent their garments, *πας εσθητας περιερρηξαντο*, and on their knees besought the people not to push things to extremity, lest the consequence should be their ruin. And when the tumult, which was thus allayed, was like to be revived, they had recourse to the same expedient: *τους δε αρχιερεις αυτους ην ιδειν καταμωμενους μεν της κεφαλης κονιν, γυμνους δε τα στερνα των σθητων περιερρηξμενων.** The rabbies say, the high-priest was allowed to rend his clothes at the bottom, but not from the top to the bottom,† which was the common way. They tell us, moreover, that it must be done standing, which they ground on the example of David, who, it is said, on a report that Absalom had slain all his brethren, arose and tore his garments; 2 Sam. xiii. 31. They add, that the rent must not be more than a hand's breadth, and that it must be made in the upper garment, and in the fore-part of it.‡

The third peculiarity of the high-priest consisted in his presiding over the inferior priests, in taking care that all things were conducted with decency, and according to the law, and in performing himself some appropriate parts of the divine service.

Godwin saith, that both the high-priest and the inferior priests burnt incense, and offered sacrifices, 1 Chron. vi. 49, and even slew the victims, 2 Chron. xxix. 22; that they both sounded the trumpet, either for an alarm in war, or to assemble the people and their rulers, Numb. x. 1—8; that they both instructed the people, Lev. x. 11; Deut. xvii. 8—12; Mal. ii. 7; and both judged and determined concerning leprosy, Lev. xiii. 2; and he might have added, concerning cases of adultery by the waters of jealousy, Numb. v. 19; and concerning things vowed, or devoted, the former being redeem-

* De Bello Judaic. lib. ii. cap. xv. sect. ii. iv. edit. Haverc.

† Mishn. tit. Horajoth. cap. iii. sect. v. tom. iv. p. 501, edit. Surenhus.

‡ Vid. Maimon. de Luctu. cap. viii. sect. i. ii.

able at a valuation or price set by the priest, the latter not; Lev. xxvii. 8. 28.

It belonged likewise to the priests to set on and remove the shew-bread; to tend and supply the lamps, Lev. xxiv. 1—9; to burn the red heifer, Numb. xix. 2; to bless the people, Numb. vi. 23—27; and to keep watch in three several places of the temple; 2 Chron. xxiii. 4. No doubt the high-priest had power or authority, in virtue of his office, to perform any part of the sacerdotal service, and several of the articles already mentioned are expressly declared to pertain to him as well as to the inferior priests; however, some of the more laborious parts of the service were ordinarily performed by the inferior priests under his direction.

On the other hand, he had his peculiar province, the principal branches of which were, inquiring of the Lord, and giving answers by Urim and Thummim, and performing the most holy parts of the divine service, especially on the great annual fast, or day of expiation, when, clothed in his linen garments, he went alone into the holy of holies, and there burnt incense, and sprinkled some of the blood of the sacrifice upon the mercy-seat; Lev. xvi. throughout, and Heb. ix. 7.

The duties of his office on that day will be considered in their place, when we are treating of the Jewish festivals.

It is, however, proper here to take notice of what our author observes concerning the high-priest's suffragan, or deputy, called סַגָּן *sagan*, as some write it, or, as others, סֶגֶן *segen*, who, in case of the high-priest's incapacity by sickness or any legal uncleanness, discharged his office for him. The word סגן *sagan*, in the singular number, is never used in Scripture; but the plural סגנים *seganim* several times occurs, and seems always to import secular rulers, or governors; as particularly in the book of Nehemiah, where the סגנים *seganim* are joined with the nobles, and are not improperly called rulers in the English version, Nehem. iv. 14—19. In Isaiah, chap. xli. 25, we style them princes; and Daniel is said to be made chief of the *seganim*, which we there render governors; Dan. ii. 48. And certain it is, his was not an ecclesiastical, but civil office. So that in all those places, and wherever else the word occurs in the Hebrew Bible, it evidently imports secular dignity and authority. Nevertheless, the singular

noun sagan is often used by the Hebrew doctors for an ecclesiastical person. The Targum of Jonathan, on the Second Book of Kings, renders "the priest of the second order" the sagan of the priests, on 2 Kings xxiii. 4; and calls "Zephaniah, the second priest," the sagan, on 2 Kings xxv. 18. And in the prophecy of Jeremiah it in one place styles him (Jer. lii. 24), and in another, Pashur (Jer. xx. 1), the sagan of the priests. It is agreed on all hands, that the sagan was next to the high-priest, and his vicegerent; but for what end he was appointed, and what were the duties of his office, is disputed. One opinion, espoused by Cunæus,* is, that he was only to officiate for the high-priest, in case he was rendered incapable of attending the service through sickness, or legal uncleanness, on the day of expiation. Josephus gives an instance of the service of that day being performed by one Joseph, the son of Eli, as deputy, or sagan, of the high-priest Matthias, who the night before had been accidentally rendered unclean;† and Mr. Selden‡ informs us, out of the Jerusalem and Babylonish Talmud, that Simeon, the high-priest, being rendered unclean by some drops of spittle falling on his garments the day before, his brother Judah officiated as his sagan on the day of expiation. The patrons of this opinion tell us the sagan was appointed the preceding evening, and for the service of that day only. So that, according to them, there was a new sagan every year, or, at least, he was appointed anew to his office. The mishnical book Joma§ tells us farther, that they not only appointed a sagan for the high-priest, in case he should be polluted, but likewise a wife, in case his wife should die on that day, or the night before. For it is said, "He shall make atonement for himself, and for his house;" Lev. xvi. 6. Now a house, it is said, implies a wife, which, therefore, he must not be without on that day.

After all, the sagan's officiating for the high-priest on the day of expiation has no foundation in Scripture, by which no man is allowed to officiate in the holy of holies but the high-

* De Repub. Hebr. lib. ii. cap. vi.

† Antiq. lib. xvii. cap. vi. sect. iv. edit. Haverc.

‡ De Success. in Pontificat. lib. i. cap. xii. apud Opera, vol. i. tom. i. p. 145, 146, Londini, 1726.

§ Cap. i. sect. i. tom. ii. p. 206, edit. Surenhus.

priest; and if, therefore, he was sick, or otherwise disabled, that part of the service must, no doubt, be omitted; which, in case of necessity, it might be, without such bad consequence as the rabbies apprehend, who make the efficacy of all the sacrifices of the ensuing year to depend upon it.

Others think the sagan was the high-priest's vicar, or suffragan, to assist him in the care of (and in his absence to oversee) the affairs of the temple and the service of the priests. Dr. Lightfoot, in support of this opinion, observes,* that the sagan is commonly called, both in the Targum † and by the rabbies, סגן הכאנים *sagan haccoanim*, the sagan of the priests, which seems to import, that his office referred as much (if not more) to the common priests, as to the high-priest. Maimonides in particular says,‡ "all the priests were at the command of the sagan." According to this opinion, his office was not for a day only, but probably for life, at least till he became superannuated, or till the high-priest's death. Some say he was always heir apparent to the high-priesthood, and that none could be high-priest, who had not first been sagan.§ To this Dr. Lightfoot objects, not only that it could not be the case under the second temple, and after the days of Herod, when the pontifical dignity was at the arbitrary disposal of the Roman presidents, who preferred to it whom they pleased; but even in earlier ages, when the succession was legal and regular, we do not find that he whom the Targum calls sagan, always succeeded on a demise. There is not the least intimation that Zephaniah, who in the Second Book of Kings is called the second priest, or sagan, was the son of Seraiah the high-priest, or succeeded him in his office; 2 Kings xxv. 18.

Upon the whole, it is probable, that he who was next in the succession to the high-priesthood, was for the most part appointed sagan, but not always, since it required a person of learning and experience in the laws and ritual to assist the

* Temple Service, chap. v. sect. i.; and Horæ Hebraicæ on Luke iii. 2.

† See Targum Jonathan on 2 Kings xxv. 18, and Jer. lii. 24.

‡ Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, cap. iv. sect. xvi. apud Crenii Fascicul. Sext. p. 115.

§ R. Solom. in Numb. xix. and Talmud Hierosolym. quoted in Lightfoot's Temple Service, chap. iv.

high-priest, especially if he were a weak man; and therefore it is likely they regarded merit rather than birth in the choice and appointment of this officer.

The divine institution of him is conceived to be in the following passage of the book of Numbers: "Eleazar, the son of Aaron the priest, shall be chief over the chief of the Levites, and have the oversight of them that keep the charge of the sanctuary;" Numb. iii. 32. Thus, it appears, there were some among the priests and Levites, who had pre-eminence and authority over their brethren; each, perhaps, being an overseer to a certain number, or presiding in a particular branch of the service of the sanctuary; but Eleazar was chief over these chiefs. Hence, says Ainsworth,* arises the distinction of the high-priest and the second priest. And when Aaron was dead, and Eleazar, the second priest, was high-priest in his room, Numb. xx. 26. 28, then Phinehas, Eleazar's son, succeeded him in the office of second priest, or governor over the Levites; for Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, is said in the First Book of Chronicles to have been ruler over them, that is, the Levites, in time past; 1 Chron. ix. 20.

From hence it should seem, the hint was first taken of appointing, besides bishops, who have the oversight of the priests in particular dioceses, archbishops, who have the oversight of the bishops of several dioceses, or are "chief of the chiefs." But the New Testament is totally silent concerning such an institution for the government of the Christian church.

The rabbies speak of three other sorts of sacerdotal officers, superior to common priests, but inferior to the high-priest and sagan; קתוליקין *katholikin*, אמרכלין *immarcalin*, and גזברין *gizbarin*.

There were two *katholikin*, of whom Maimonides† gives this short account, that they were to the sagan as the sagan to the high-priest, namely, substitutes and assistants, and next in place and honour. According to other Hebrew writers, their office related to the treasuries of the temple, and to the management of the revenues arising from the oblations.

The *immarcalin* were seven, who carried the keys of the seven gates of the court, and one could not open them without

* In loc. † De Apparatu Templi, cap. iv. sect. xvii.

the rest.* According to which account, each gate must have seven different locks, the keys of which were severally kept by the seven *immarcalin*. Some of the rabbies tell us, there were seven rooms at the seven gates; in which the sacred vessels and vestments were kept, under the care of these officers.†

The *gizbarin* were not to be less than three, who were a sort of treasurers, or collectors of the offerings brought to the temple,‡ which they accounted for to the *immarcalin*, and they to the *katholikin*, and all under the inspection of the high-priest and sagan. But having no mention of these officers in the sacred Scriptures, we shall enter into no farther particulars concerning them.§

We proceed to speak of the inferior priests. These were grown so numerous in David's time, that it became very inconvenient for them to attend the service at the tabernacle all together. He therefore divided them into twenty-four companies, who were to serve in rotation, each company by itself, for a week; 1 Chron. xxiv. throughout. That he did this by divine appointment, appears from the following passage: "David gave to Solomon his son the pattern of all that he had by the Spirit, of the courts of the house of the Lord; also for the courses, מחלקות *machlekoth*, of the priests and the Levites;" 1 Chron. xxviii. 11—13. These courses are here called מחלקות *machlekoth*, from חלק *chalak, divisit:* and in Nehemiah, משמרות *mishmaroth*, from שמר *shamar, custodivit*, Nehem. xiii. 30. The Septuagint renders both these words by *εφημεριαι*, in which they are followed by St. Luke, who saith that Zacharias the priest, the father of John the Baptist, was *εξ εφημεριας Αβια*, of the course of Abia; Luke i. 5. The word *εφημερια* is derived from the form of the Athenian republic. The country of Attica was divided into ten *φυλας*, or tribes; fifty persons were chosen out of each tribe, who composed the senate; and each fifty sat and governed for one day in their turns. Hence their *Αρχη*, or form of government, was called *εφημερος*; because their governors were daily

* Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, ubi supra.

† Joseph. ad Shekalim, cap. v. R. Solom. in 2 Kings xii.

‡ Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, cap. iv. sect. xviii. ubi supra.

§ See Lightfoot's Temple Service, ubi supra.

changed according to a regular rotation.* Now there being a considerable resemblance between this division and succession of the Attic senators and that of the Jewish priests, the Septuagint applies the word *εφημερια* to the courses of the priests; though somewhat improperly, because they shifted not daily but weekly, as is concluded from its being said in Chronicles, that the porters of the gate were relieved by their brethren every seven days, 1 Chron. ix. 25; and if the inferior officers relieved one another weekly, it is reasonable to suppose the priests did so too. There is the more reason for this conclusion, because the courses of the priests and of the porters are mentioned together in the account of Solomon's confirming the regulation which his father David had made: "He appointed, according to the order of David his father, the courses of the priests to their service, and the Levites to their charge, the porters also by their courses at every gate;" 2 Chron. viii. 14. The time of shifting the courses seems to have been the sabbath; for the priests are described by this periphrasis, "Those that enter in on the sabbath;" 2 Kings xi. 5. So that each course attended the service of the sanctuary, for a week, twice a-year.

The Jewish writers say, the first circulation of the courses began on the first sabbath of the month Nisan, answering to our March and April; and the second on the first sabbath of the month Tizri, answering to our September and October; and so they make two circulations to complete the year. But whereas there were but twenty-four courses, which therefore in this double circulation would fill up only forty-eight weeks, or eleven months, they say the weeks of the three great feasts were not taken into this account; for then all the courses attended, being all obliged by the law to appear before the Lord; Exod. xxiii. 17. If so, the double circulation of the twenty-four courses would very near complete the Jewish year.

Each course had its respective head, or chief. These are called, "chief men of the houses of their fathers;" of whom there were sixteen, and consequently sixteen courses, of the posterity of Eleazar, and eight of the posterity of Ithamar; 1 Chron. xxiv. 4. These chiefs of their respective divisions

* Vid. Joseph. Scaliger. de Emendatione Tempor. lib. i. p. 25, and 62, 63.

were called שרי הכהנים *sarè haccohanim*, princes, or chiefs of the priests: Ezra viii. 24; chap. x. 5. These were probably the *αρχιερεις*, or chief priests, so often mentioned in the New Testament: Matt. xvi. 21; xxvii. 12. 41; John vii. 32; xviii. 3; Acts ix. 14, &c. These chief priests are, in several places, mentioned together with the elders, scribes, and pharisees of chief note, as being fellow-members of the Sanhedrim, the supreme court of judicature.

The order in which the several courses were to serve was determined by lot, 1 Chron. xxiv. 5; and each course was, in all succeeding ages, called by the name of its chief at the time of its first division. Thus Zacharias is said to be of the course of Abia, the eighth course; of which Abijah, or Abia, was the chief in David's time; ver. 10. And Josephus says,* he himself was of the first course, or the course of Jehoiarib, upon whom the first lot fell; ver. 7.

As the great number of the sacerdotal order occasioned their being first divided into twenty-four companies, so in after times the number of each company grew too large for them all to minister together; for there were no less, according to Josephus, than five thousand priests in one course, in his time.† The Jewish writers, therefore, tell us, that the ministry of each course was divided according to the number of the houses of their fathers that were contained in it.‡ For instance, if a course consisted of five such houses, three served three days, and the other two, two days a-piece. If it contained six, five served five days, and the other, two days. If it contained seven, the priests of each house served a day.§ And they farther inform us, that the particular branches of the service were assigned by lot to each priest, whose turn it was to attend on the ministry; as who should kill the sacrifices, who sprinkle the blood, who burn the incense, &c.‖ Thus St. Luke tells us, that "according to the custom of the priest's office, it was the lot of Zacharias to burn incense,

* Joseph. Vita, ab initio.

† Joseph. contra Appion. cap. ii. vol. ii. p. 477, edit. Havercamp.

‡ Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, cap. iv. sect. xi. p. 113, Crenii Fasicul. Sext.

§ Talmud. Hieros. in Taanith, cap. iv. et Thosaph. ad loc. See the passage quoted by Lightfoot, Temple Service, chap. vi. sub fine.

‖ Mishn. Tamidh. cap. iii. sect. i. tom. v. p. 291, edit. Surenhus.

when he went into the temple of the Lord;" Luke i. 9. The rabbies say, but four of the courses returned from the captivity, those mentioned in Ezra, namely, "the children of Jedaiah of the house of Joshua, the children of Immer, the children of Pashur, and the children of Harim;" Ezra ii. 36—39. And they tell us in what manner the priests were divided by lot into twenty-four courses, which were still called by the ancient names.* But it may be objected to this account, that Pashur was not the ancient head or name of any of the twenty-four courses; and that in the catalogue of the priests who returned from the captivity, which we have in the twelfth chapter of Nehemiah, there are the names of several others of the chiefs or heads of the courses, besides the three mentioned by Ezra; as Shechaniah, who was the head of the tenth course; Abijah, the head of the eighth; Bilgah, the head of the fifteenth; and Jojarib, who was the head of the first course. It is probable, that the chief of each course was always called by the name of him who was its chief at its first division in the days of David.

Not only were the priests divided into twenty-four courses, but the Levites, and indeed the whole people of Israel, as will be seen when we come to speak of the *viri stationarii*, whom our author mentions toward the close of this chapter.

The Levites being, in the larger sense of the word, the posterity of the patriarch Levi, the third son of Jacob by Leah, were one of the twelve tribes of Israel; but in a more restrained and peculiar sense, they were a lower order of ecclesiastical persons, inferior to the priests, and their assistants in the sacred service. In this subordinate capacity were all the males of the tribe of Levi, beside the family of Aaron, who were the priests; and it is very observable, that the posterity of Moses were no more than common Levites, while the descendants of his brother Aaron were advanced, by the appointment of his law, to the dignity of the priesthood; 1 Chron. xxiii. 13, 14. A plain evidence that Moses was influenced by no worldly or ambitious views; or rather, that he was not the contriver and author of the law which he gave to Israel, but received it from God: for had he framed it, it is natural to suppose, he would have made some better provision

* Talmud. Hieros. et Thosaph. ad Taanith, ubi supra.

than he did, for his sons, and for the grandeur of his house, and not have advanced his brother's above his own.

Indeed, the Levites were appointed to the service of the sanctuary by God himself, for the following reason:—

When he miraculously destroyed all the first-born of the Egyptians, Exod. xii. 29, he spared the first-born of the Israelites, and, in order to preserve the memory of the miracle, and of that great deliverance from their bondage in Egypt which it occasioned, he was pleased to appoint, that for the future all the first-born males "should be set apart unto himself:" Exod. xiii. 12—16; Numb. viii. 17. But afterward, upon the sons of Levi discovering an extraordinary zeal against idolatry in the case of the golden calf, Exod. xxxii. 26—28, he was pleased to assign the honour of attending his immediate service to that whole tribe, instead of the first-born of Israel; Numb. iii. 12, 13; chap. viii. 18. And that it might appear there was a just substitution of the Levites for the first-born, number for number, he ordered an estimate to be made of both; and when, on casting up the poll, the first-born were found to exceed the Levites by two hundred seventy-three, the surplus was redeemed at the price of five shekels a-head, which was paid to the priests for the use of the sanctuary; Numb. iii. 14, to the end.

The Levites, originally, were distinguished into three classes, or families, from the three sons of Levi, Kohath, Gershon, and Merari, called Kohathites, Gershonites, and Merarites; though afterward by David, as we have already observed, they, as well as the priests, were divided into twenty-four courses: 1 Chron. xxiii. 6; chap. xxviii. 11. 13. A great part of the service assigned them, on their first institution in the wilderness, was peculiar to the state of the Israelites at that time, namely, taking down the tabernacle, setting it up, and carrying it about, as they removed from place to place.* To the Kohathites was committed the charge of the most sacred things, the ark of the testimony, and all the instruments of the sanctuary. The Gershonites were to take down, carry, and put up, the curtains of the tabernacle, and its covering of badger skins, and the veil, or curtains, which served for a

* See the respective service of the classes in the fourth chapter of Numbers.

door; as also the curtain which formed the court round it. The Merarites had the care of the boards of the tabernacle, with the bars, pillars, and sockets, both of the tabernacle and of the court.

When the Israelites were settled in the land of Canaan, and the tabernacle was no longer carried about as before, the service of the Levites was of course changed, and became much easier. On which account, in David's time, they were thought fit to enter on their office at twenty years old, 1 Chron. xxiii. 24. 27, 28; whereas they were not admitted, by the original appointment of Moses, till they were twenty-five or thirty, and were discharged at fifty, Numb. iv. 3. 23. 43, and chap. viii. 24, 25; probably because their service was then very laborious, and required great bodily strength. I say, they were not to enter on their office till they were twenty-five or thirty years old;—the account in the fourth chapter of Numbers saith, they are to "do the work of the tabernacle of the congregation from thirty years old and upward;" and in the eighth chapter it is said, that "from twenty-five years old and upward they should go in to wait on the service of the tabernacle of the congregation." In order to reconcile these two accounts, some suppose, that from twenty-five to thirty years of age they attended only to learn the duties of their office, but did not actually perform any part of the service till they were fully thirty. This is the opinion of Maimonides.* But other rabbies† tell us, they entered on the easier and lighter parts of the service, such as keeping watch at the sanctuary, and bearing a part in the choir, at twenty-five; but did not meddle with the more laborious till thirty. The Jews indeed inform us, that the Levites passed through four different degrees. From one month old to their twentieth year they were instructed in the law of God; from twenty to twenty-five, in the functions of their ministry; from thence to thirty they served a sort of apprenticeship, beginning to exercise themselves in some of the lower branches of the sacred service; and lastly, when they attained their thirtieth year, they were fully instituted in their office. Some have observed

* De Apparatu Templi, cap. iii. sect. vii.; and also the Babylonish Gemara, Cholin, cap. i.

† Aben-Ezra on Numb. viii.

much the same degrees among the vestal virgins, which perhaps were borrowed from the Jewish Levites. Thirty years they were bound to the strictest chastity; the first ten of which were spent in learning the mysteries of their profession; the second ten they ministered in holy things; and the last ten were employed in bringing up young novices.* Some have thought, and in particular our author, that the apostle alludes to these degrees of the Levites when he tells Timothy, that they who perform the office of a deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree, καλον βαθμον; 1 Tim. iii. 13.

Moses ordered, that at the age of fifty the Levites should "cease waiting upon the service of the tabernacle, and should serve no more;" Numb. viii. 25. Yet he immediately adds, "They shall minister with their brethren in the tabernacle of the congregation, to keep the charge, and shall do no service." It seems, therefore, they were not dismissed; but, while they were exempted from all laborious employment, continued to execute the easier part of their ministry; and, probably, instructed the younger Levites in the duties of their office.

We have seen before, that the Levites were originally divided into three families. In David's time they were distinguished into three classes, to each of which a different service was assigned; and probably each was divided into twenty-four courses. The first class were "to wait upon the sons of Aaron, for the service of the house of the Lord;" that is, to assist the priests in the exercise of their ministry, "to purify the holy things, to prepare the shew-bread, and flour, and wine, and oil for the sacrifice: and sometimes to kill the sacrifice," when there was more work of the sort than the priest could conveniently perform: 1 Chron. xxiii. 28, 29; 2 Chron. xxix. 34; and chap. xxxv. 10—14. So that it was not necessary that the sacrifice should be slain by the priest, as some erroneously suppose, alleging against the consideration of Christ's death as a proper sacrifice, that he must, in that case, in the character of a priest, have slain himself.

The second class of Levites formed the temple choir: the division of this class into twenty-four courses is expressly recorded in the twenty-fifth chapter of the First Book of Chronicles. Some imagine there were women singers, as well as

* Dionys. Halicarn. lib. ii.

men, in the temple choir; because in the book of Ezra, among those who returned from the Babylonish captivity, there are said to have been two hundred, Ezra ii. 65, and elsewhere we read of two hundred forty-five, Nehem. vii. 67, singing men and women. The Jewish doctors will, indeed, by no means admit there were any female voices in the temple choir; and as for those משררות *meshoreroth*, as they are called in the Hebrew, they suppose them to be the wives of those who sung.* Nevertheless the following passage makes it evident, that women, likewise, were thus employed: "God gave to Heman fourteen sons and three daughters; and all these were under the hands of their father for song in the house of the Lord, with cymbals, psalteries, and harps, for the service of the house of God;" 1 Chron. xxv. 5, 6.

Instrumental music was first introduced into the Jewish service by Moses, and afterward, by the express command of God, was very much improved with the addition of several instruments in the reign of David. When Hezekiah restored the temple service, which had been neglected in his predecessor's reign, it is said, that "he set the Levites in the house of the Lord, with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and of Gad the king's seer, and Nathan the prophet; for so was the commandment of the Lord by his prophets;" 2 Chron. xxix. 25. The instruments originally appointed in the law of Moses were only two; namely, the חצוצרת *chatsotseroth*, or silver trumpets, Numb. x. 2, which they "were to blow in their solemn days, and over their burnt-offerings, and over the sacrifices of their peace-offerings," ver. 10; and the שופר *shophar*, or cornet, as the word is rendered in the following passage of the Psalmist: "With trumpets and sound of cornet make a joyful noise before the Lord, the King;" Psalm xcviii. 6. Here it is expressly distinguished from the trumpet, though in many other places, in our version, it is confounded with it. As we are informed, that the שופרות *shopheroth*, used at the siege of Jericho, were of "rams' horns," Josh. vi. 4, it is probable this instrument was made of horn, and is therefore properly rendered a cornet. It was appointed by the law to be blown throughout

* Reland. Antiq. part ii. cap. vi. sect. vi. p. 235, third edit. 1717.

the land, when they proclaimed the year of jubilee, on the day of atonement; Lev. xxv. 9. It may be observed, that as no other instruments are prescribed by the ritual, besides the trumpet and the cornet, it is likely they were the only ones at that time in use among the Jews, and which they had skill to play on, except we reckon the תוף *toph*, or timbrel, which was used by the women; Exod. xv. 20. But as that was properly a sort of tabor, without any variety of notes, used only to accompany the voice, it hardly deserves to be ranked among the musical instruments. It is not indeed likely the Israelites, who were a poor labouring people, but lately come from working at the brick-kilns, should have much skill in music at the time of their receiving the law; only some could make shift to sound the horn, or the trumpet, which therefore was all the music that could then be prescribed to attend the sacrifices. But when they were grown more polite and skilful, in the reign of David, several other instruments were added by divine direction. When some, therefore, plead for instrumental music in Christian worship, as pleasing to God, though not commanded, from the notion of its having been first introduced into the Jewish worship by David, without any divine institution, notwithstanding which God approved of it, they commit two mistakes. For David did not introduce any part of the temple music without an express divine injunction: "So was the commandment of the Lord by his prophets." And it was not first brought in by him, but by Moses, who prescribed it to attend the sacrifices, so far as it could be practised in those times. And when, in after-ages, they were more skilful in music, and capable of performing the service in a better manner, they were required so to do; nevertheless, not one new instrument was then added without divine direction and appointment. But to return to the temple choir.

The music there used was both vocal and instrumental: "As well singers as players on instruments shall be there;" Psalm lxxxvii. 7. In David's time there were appointed three masters of the band of music, Heman, Asaph, and Ethan, 1 Chron. xv. 17; whose names are prefixed to some of the psalms, perhaps because they set them to music. Asaph's name is inscribed to the fiftieth, seventy-third, and ten following psalms; Heman's to the eighty-eighth; and Ethan's to the

eighty-ninth. There was also, over all the rest, one chief musician, or head master of the choir, to whom several of the psalms are inscribed, or to whose care it was entrusted to have them set to music, and performed in the tabernacle or temple. At the time of writing the thirty-ninth, sixty-second, and seventy-seventh psalms, this master's name was Jeduthun.

The vocal music was performed by the Levites. The Hebrew doctors say, the number of voices must not be less than twelve, but might be more without limitation.* They add, that the youth, the sons of the Levites, bore a part with their fathers in the choir; which they ground on this passage in the book of Ezra,† "Then stood Joshua with his sons, Kadmiel and his sons, and sung together by course, in praising and giving thanks unto the Lord;" chap. iii. 9—11.

As for instrumental music, though it was performed chiefly by the Levites, yet, the rabbies say, other Israelites who were skilful, if they were men of worth and piety, might bear a part.‡ This they ground on the account we have, that on occasion of David's fetching the ark from "Kirjath-jearim, he and all the house of Israel played before the Lord on all manner of instruments;" 2 Sam. vi. 5.

In the temple choir there were both wind and stringed instruments; the chief of the former was the חצצרה *chatsotserah*, which we have spoken of before. The name of it is supposed to have had an affinity with, and to be formed from its sound. We find that this music attended at the service of the altar. Thus when Solomon and all the people offered sacrifices at the dedication of the temple, "the Levites played on instruments of music, and the priests sounded trumpets before them;" 2 Chron. vii. 6. And when Hezekiah purified the house of the Lord, and restored the temple service, and on that occasion offered sacrifices, "the Levites stood with the instruments of David, and the priests with the trumpets," 2 Chron. xxix. 26; and so likewise in many other places. In both these passages the priests are said to sound the trumpets, and not the Levites, who played on other instruments. And thus, when David brought up the ark out of the house of

* Gnerachin in Mishn. cap. ii. sect. vi.; Maimon. et Bartenor. in loc. et Gemara, fol. 11. 6; Maimon. de Appar. Templi, cap. iii. sect. iii.

† Glossa, ibid. ‡ Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, ubi supra.

Obed-edom, the Levites were appointed to be singers with instruments of music, psalteries, harps, and cymbals, and the priests did blow with the trumpets, 1 Chron. xv. 16—24, as it was prescribed in the law of Moses, "The son of Aaron the priest shall blow with the trumpets;" Numb. x. 8.

According to the Hebrew doctors, there must be two trumpets at least, Numb. x. 2, and not more than a hundred and twenty,* because that was the number used when the ark was brought into Solomon's temple; 2 Chron. v. 12. They say, that in singing the psalms, the voices and instruments made three intermissions or pauses, which they call פרקים *perakim*, from פרק *parak, rupit;* and that then the priests sounded the trumpets. So that Dr. Lightfoot says, the trumpets were never joined with the choir in concert, but sounded only when the choir was silent.† However, in this he is undoubtedly mistaken; for on the occasion above referred to, of bringing the ark into the temple, we find the trumpets, and voices, and cymbals, and other instruments of music, united in one grand chorus: "The trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound in praising the Lord; and they lift up their voices with the trumpets and cymbals, and instruments of music, and praised the Lord;" 2 Chron. v. 13.

Another wind instrument in use among the Jews, was the חליל *chalil*, the pipe, flute, or hautboy. The rabbies say, it was used only on twelve days in the year;‡ but it does not appear in Scripture, that it was ever used in the temple service. It is said, indeed, in Isaiah, "Ye shall have gladness of heart, as when one goeth with a pipe to come into the mount of the Lord, to the Mighty One of Israel;" Isa. xxx. 29. But that may probably allude to the people's having music playing before them, when they came in companies from all parts of the country, to pay their worship at the national altar on the three grand festivals. The חליל *chalil*,

* Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, cap. iii. sect. iv. Crenii Fascic. Sexti, p. 103; Mishn. in Gnerachin, cap. ii. sect. v.; et de Bartenor. in loc.; et Maimon. in sect. vi. p. 197, 198, tom. v. edit. Surenhus.

† Temple Service, chap. vii. sect. ii.

‡ Maimon. ubi supra, sect. vi.; Mishn. in Gnerachin, cap. ii. sect. iii. p. 196, tom. v.

might be a common instrument, used on that occasion, though not in the temple choir.

The other musical instruments, chiefly used in the sacred service, were the נבלים *nebhalim*, כנרות *kinnoroth*, and the מצלתים *metsiltaim*, which in the fifteenth chapter of the First Book of Chronicles we render psalteries, harps, and cymbals; 1 Chron. xv. 16. The נבל *nebhel*, and the כנר *kinnor*, the psaltery and harp, are both said to be stringed instruments. Josephus describes the *kinnor* as having ten χορδαι, or strings (which, as the word signifies, were all open notes, in the manner of our harps, or harpsichords); and the *nebhel* as having twelve φθογγοι, notes or sounds; produced by stopping with frets in the manner of our viols; for so Dr. Lightfoot imagines these two words should be explained. Josephus farther saith, that the *kinnor* was struck πληκτρο, with a quill, as we play on the dulcimer; and the *nebhel* twanged with the fingers, as we play on the lute.* But if they had got into the way, by stopping, of playing several notes on one string, in Josephus's time, I much suspect they had not that contrivance in David's; because he seems to speak of an instrument of ten strings as the grandest and most excellent of all, on account of the number of its strings: Psalm xxxiii. 2; xcii. 3; cxliv. 9. Whereas if they had had the way of stopping them, as we do the violin, I can see no sufficient reason, why such a number of strings should be reckoned a mark of excellence, when fewer would have reached as large a compass as they had ever occasion for. It seems, therefore, as if ten open strings, or ten notes, was the whole compass of their music in those days. And to this time the eastern music hath but a small compass of notes.

The צלצל *tseltsel*, which both the Septuagint, in 1 Chron. xv. 16, and Josephus† translate κυμβαλον, the cymbal, seems to have been neither a wind nor stringed instrument, but something made of metal, which gave a sound with striking upon it, without any variety of notes, like a bell. Josephus gives no other description of cymbals, but that they were great and broad, and made of brass. Mr. Lampe has written a

* Joseph. Antiq. lib. vii. cap. xii. sect. viii. edit. Haverc.; and Lightfoot's Temple Service, ubi supra

† Ubi supra.

treatise *de Cymbalis Veterum*. And Sir Richard Ellis, who hath one on the same subject in his *Fortuita Sacra*, shows the ancient cymbals were generally two brass hemispheres, or basons, which the musicians struck against one another with great address, in time to the song or other music which they accompanied. This is the instrument to which the apostle alludes, when he compareth a professor of religion without charity or love, to "the sounding brass or tinkling cymbal;" 1 Cor. xiii. 1. The Hebrew name צלצל *tseltsel*, is probably taken from its repeated, uniform sound; and so may the Greek word αλαλαζον, which we translate by a like, namely, tinkling. Perhaps our kettle-drums may be supposed to succeed the cymbals of the ancients, though, if the rabbies say right, there was but one cymbal in the temple concert,* and it could not, therefore, answer the same end our kettle-drums do; which are always placed in pairs, and being tuned at a fourth to each other, make an agreeable bass to the trumpet.

There are some other instruments, of which we have no remaining description, mentioned in the hundred and fiftieth Psalm, as used in praising God, but whether in the temple-service does not appear. The use of instrumental music in public worship was one of the typical ceremonies of the Jewish religion, which is abrogated, therefore, with the rest, by the gospel dispensation, and there is no revival of this institution in the New Testament. The ancient fathers were so far from practising or approving instrumental music in Christian worship, that some of them would hardly allow it was used in the Jewish, but put allegorical interpretations on the texts that mention it. The unknown author of the Commentary on the Psalms, in St. Jerome's works, makes the instrument of ten strings, to signify the ten commandments, in Psalm xxxiii. 2, and xliii. 4, &c. And he hath this notable observation on the following passage, "Praise him with stringed instruments and organs," Psalm cl. 4: that the guts being twisted by reason of abstinence from food, and so all carnal desires subdued, men are found fit for the kingdom of God, to sing his praise. St. Basil calls musical instruments the invention of Jubal, of the race of Cain.† And Clement of Alexandria says, they

* Mishn. ubi supra, sect. v.; Maimon. ubi supra, sect. iv.

† Comment. in Isaiah, cap. v. apud Oper. tom. i. p. 56, edit. Paris, 1618.

are better for beasts than men.* That musical instruments were not used even in the Popish church in Thomas Aquinas's time, about the year 1250, appears from this passage in his questions:† "In the old law, God was praised both with musical instruments and human voices; but the Christian church does not use instruments to praise him, lest she should seem to Judaize." So that it seems, instrumental music hath been introduced into Christian worship within about the last five hundred years, in the darkest and most corrupt times of Popery. It is retained in the Lutheran church, contrary to the opinion of Luther, who, as Eckard confesses, reckoned organs among the ensigns of Baal. Organs are still used in some of the Dutch churches, but against the minds of their pastors; for in the national synod at Middleburgh, anno 1581, and in that of Holland and Zealand, anno 1594, it was resolved that they would endeavour to obtain of the magistrates, the laying aside of organs, and the singing with them in churches.‡ The Church of England also, in her homilies, strongly remonstrates against the use of organs, and other instruments of music in churches. In the homily on the place and time of prayer, after mention of piping, singing, chanting, and playing on organs, which was in use before the Reformation, we are exhorted "greatly to rejoice, and give thanks to God that our churches are delivered out of these things, that displeased God so sore, and so filthily defiled the holy house and place of prayer." I only add, that the voice of harpers and musicians, and of pipers and trumpeters, is mentioned among the glories of the mystical Babylon, "that mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, whom God will destroy with the sword of his mouth, and with the brightness of his coming;" Rev. xviii. 22. But to return to the Levites.

The third class were the porters, to whose charge the several gates of the courts of the sanctuary were appointed by lot; 1 Chron. xxvi. 1. 13. 19. "They waited at every gate; and were not permitted to depart from their service;" 2 Chron.

* Pædag. lib. ii. cap. iv. init.

† Secunda secundæ Questio xci. art. iv. conclus. iv.

‡ Vid. Apolog. (Hicmanni) pro Ministris in Anglâ Nonconformistis, p. 139.

xxxv. 15: and they attended by turns in their courses, as the other Levites did; see 2 Chron. viii. 14.

Their proper business was to open and shut the gates, and to attend at them by day, as a sort of peace-officers, in order to prevent any tumult among the people; to keep strangers, and the excommunicated and unclean persons, from entering into the holy court; and, in short, to prevent whatever might be prejudicial to the safety, peace, and purity of the holy place and service.

The rabbies assign several particular works to these porters, as brushing the gate, cleaning the gilding, &c., which probably belonged to their office, as they had the charge of the sacred buildings, but of which there is no occasion to speak distinctly.

They also kept guard by night about the temple and its courts; and they are said to have been twenty-four,* including three priests, who stood sentry at so many different places. There was a superior officer over the whole guard, called by Maimonides† "the man of the mountain of the house;" he walked the round as often as he pleased; when he passed a sentinel that was standing, he said, "Peace be unto you;" but if he found one asleep, he struck him, and he had liberty to set fire to his garment. This custom may, perhaps, be alluded to in the following passage: "Behold, I come as a thief," that is, unawares; "blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments;" Rev. xvi. 15. The hundred and thirty-fourth Psalm seems to be addressed to these watchmen of the temple, "who by night stand in the house of the Lord;" in which they are exhorted to employ their waking hours in acts of praise and devotion. Thus the Levites, as it is said in the First Book of Chronicles, were employed in the work day and night; 1 Chron. ix. 33. Godwin observes, "that some of the Levites had the charge of the treasures of the temple." It is said, that "of the Levites, Ahijah was over the treasures of the house of God, and over the treasures of the dedicated things;" 1 Chron. xxvi. 20. But I do not conceive it was a distinct class of Levites that was en-

* Maimon. de Ædificio Templi. cap. viii. sect. iv. Crenii Fascicul. Sexti, p. 70.

† Ibid. sect. x. p. 71, 72.

trusted with the treasures and dedicated things, but rather that herein they acted as assistants to the priests, or as inferior officers under them, it appearing that the high-priest, and others of the chief of the priests, had the charge of those things as well as the porters, who might probably have the immediate care of them under their superior direction. "The king commanded Hilkiah, the high-priest, and the priest of the second order, and the keepers of the doors, to bring forth out of the temple of the Lord all the vessels that were made for Baal," &c.; 2 Kings xxiii. 4. Godwin adds, that "others of the Levites were overseers and judges," שטרים *shoterim*, and שפטים *shophetim*, as they are called in the Frst Book of Chronicles, chap. xxiii. 4; where six thousand Levites are said to have been appointed to these offices in David's time. For though God had ordered, in the law of Moses, that they should appoint שפטים *shophetim*, and שטרים *shoterim*, in all their gates, Deut. xvi. 18; yet it should seem, that order and appointment had been much neglected; the heads of the tribes, perhaps, having taken upon them to judge and determine controversies in their respective tribes, only in causes of great moment allowing an appeal to the king; for that David used, himself, to act as judge, and determine controversies between his subjects, may be concluded from the following passage: "When any man that had a controversy came to the king for judgment, then Absalom called unto him, and said, Of what city art thou?" &c., 2 Sam. xv. 2. But when David was introducing his son Solomon to the throne, he was desirous of settling the inferior courts, according to the original institution, well knowing that was the likeliest way of preserving the peace, and consulting the welfare of the nation. Accordingly, he restored these judicatories to their ancient order, and constituted Levites to be officers and judges.

We have had an occasion already to speak of the distinction between the שפטים *shophetim* and שטרים *shoterim;* and we then observed, that the שפטים *shophetim* were the superior magistrates or judges, as may be concluded from that title's being applied to the chief magistrate under God, or the temporary viceroy, for several ages. As for the שטרים *shoterim*, they seem to have been the inferior officers in the judicatory courts, who attended the superior, and are therefore

continually mentioned along with them, who, by whatever title they are distinguished, whether judges, rulers, elders, or captains, still had their שטרים *shoterim:* Deut. i. 15; xvi. 18; Josh. viii. 33; 2 Chron. xix. 11; Prov. vi. 7. But in this account of David's appointment of the Levites to their offices, 1 Chron. xxiii. 4, quoted above, the שטרים *shoterim* are placed before the שפטים *shophetim:* so likewise in Josh. viii. 33. From hence Dr. Patrick conjectures, we are not to take them for inferior persons, but for men of great authority, whom the Targum calls governors, who, like our justices of the peace, saw good order kept and the laws observed, while the province of the judges was the deciding causes in their several courts.

Some think their judicial authority extended no farther than their own tribe, and the judging and determining controversies which arose among the inferior priests and Levites, especially about matters relating to the sacred ministry. But this opinion is hardly consistent with the account we have, that "Jehosaphat set of the Levites, and of the priests, along with the chief of the fathers of Israel, for the judgment of the Lord, and for controversies," 2 Chron. xix. 8; that is, all sorts of causes, both ecclesiastical and civil. And the Levites were the שטרים *shoterim*, officers, "under Amaziah, who was chief in all matters of the Lord;" and "under Zebadiah, the ruler of the house of Judah for all the king's matters," ver. 11.

Upon the whole, it should seem the magistracy belonged, not to the Levites, or any class of them, merely as Levites, but only as they generally addicted themselves more to the study of the law, and had more leisure to attend on the duties of the magistracy, than other persons who were employed in secular business.

The magistrates of different ranks, both the שפטים *shophetim* and שטרים *shoterim*,* were very generally, though not always, chosen out of that tribe. And thus the prophetic curse which Jacob pronounced upon Levi, that his posterity should be scattered amongst the tribes of Israel, Gen. xlix. 7, was remarkably accomplished (though in effect converted into a blessing), not only in respect to the appointment of their habitation (of which we shall take notice hereafter), but likewise

* See above, p. 22—24.

of their offices and employments; more of them, than perhaps of all the other tribes together, being officers and judges throughout the whole country; and, probably, as the rabbies tell us, some of them were generally directors of their seminaries of learning.*

Godwin observes, that the consecration of the Levites, in Moses's time, began at the twenty-fifth year of their age; in David's, at the twentieth; and "here," saith he, "we may note the liberty granted to the church in changing ceremonies." But he would undoubtedly have spared this note, if he had attended to what David declares, namely, that he had appointed the courses of the priests and the Levites (which included the time of their entering on their ministry), and all the service of the house of the Lord, by the express order of God himself. "All this," says David, "the Lord made me understand in a writing by his hand upon me;" 1 Chron. xxviii. 13, 19. It does not, therefore, appear from hence, that there was any such liberty given to the church under the Old Testament, as our author mentions, but rather the contrary; and, I apprehend, it will be hard to find it any where, either in the Old Testament or in the New.

As for the consecration of the Levites, when they were offered by the priest, it is said, "Aaron shall offer them before the Lord for an offering of the children of Israel," Numb. viii. 11. But the literal translation is, "Aaron shall wave them for a wavering, or wave-offering, before Jehovah." The Targum renders it, "Elevabit Aaron Levitas elevatione coram Domino." This is a manifest allusion to an ancient sacrificial rite, namely, waving the sacrifices before the Lord. This waving was of two kinds; one called תרומה *terumah*, from רום *rum, elevatus est*, which, they say, was performed by waving it perpendicularly upward and downward; the other, תנופה *tenuphah*, from נוף *nuph, agitare, movere*, which the Jewish writers tell us was performed by waving it horizontally, toward the four cardinal points, to denote the consecration of what was thus waved to the Lord of the whole

* See the authorities in Vitringa de Synag. Vetere, lib. i. part ii. cap. viii. p. 364, 365, who, however, looks upon this to be a rabbinical fiction. Dr. Lightfoot supposes the forty-eight cities of the Levites to have been a kind of universities. See his Harmony on Matt. ii. 4.

earth.* And this word is applied to the consecration of the Levites in the passage before quoted. The Septuagint renders it by *αφωριζω*; and as this word is used, in the history of the Acts, for the separation or consecration of Paul and Barnabas to the ministry of the gospel among the Gentiles, Acts xiii. 2, Godwin conceives, it is in allusion to the consecration and separation of the Jewish Levites to the ministry of the tabernacle. The same Greek word occurs concerning Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, where he saith of himself, that he was *αφωρισμενος εις εναγγελιον*, set apart for the gospel; Rom. i. 1. However, he may here allude, perhaps, to his having been a Pharisee, or פרוש *pharosh*, which coming from פרש *pharash*, *separavit*, signifies *αφωρισμενος*; and as before his conversion he gloried in being a Pharisee, *αφωρισμενος εις νομον*, so he now does in being *αφωρισμενος εις εναγγελιον*.

Another ceremony, at the consecration of the Levites, was imposition of hands: "Thou shalt bring the Levites before the Lord, and the children of Israel shall put their hands upon them;" Numb. viii. 10. By the בני ישראל *bene Israel*, children of Israel, some Jewish doctors understand the first-born,† in whose room the Levites were substituted; ver. 17, 18. And their laying their hands, every one on the head of his substitute, had the same signification as the Levites laying their hands on the heads of the bullocks that were to be sacrificed for them, ver. 12, or to suffer and die in their room and stead; that is, denoting, not only their consecration to God, but their substitution to attend the service of God at his tabernacle, instead of the first-born.

Or, if by the בני ישראל *bene Israel*, we understand, with Dr. Patrick, the elders, as representatives of the whole assembly mentioned in the words preceding, we may suppose their laying their hands on the Levites was a form of benediction; as when Jacob laid his hand on Ephraim and Manasseh, and said, "God, before whom my fathers walked, bless the lads;" Gen. xlviii. 15, 16: and as when little children were

* Abarbanel, Bechai, and Levi Ben Gerson, quoted by Outram, de Sacrificiis, p. 162.

† Vid. Ainsworth in loc.

brought to our Saviour, that he might bless them, he laid his hands upon them; Matt. xix. 15.

This ceremony, used at the consecration of the Levites, came afterward into use at the consecration of other persons into either civil or sacred offices. Joshua was consecrated captain-general of the tribes of Israel by imposition of the hands of Moses; Numb. xxvii. 18. And the same rite continued in the Christian church at the ordination of officers, both ordinary and extraordinary; particularly of the seven deacons, Acts vi. 6; of Barnabas and Saul to a special service, to which God called them, Acts xiii. 2, 3; and of ordinary pastors, 1 Tim. iv. 14, especially chap. v. 22.

There is a difference, which Godwin observes, between χειροθεσια and χειροτονια, the former signifying the consecration of a persion to an office by the imposition of hands; the latter, his election or choice by holding up of hands. It is derived from an ancient custom of the Athenians in the choice of their magistrates, among whom the candidates being proposed to the people, who signified their choice by holding up their hands, he who had most, was looked upon as duly elected.* Thus there was a brother, χειροτονηθεις απο των εκκλησιων, appointed by the suffrage of the churches to travel along with Paul, to convey their alms to the poor saints in Judea; 2 Cor. viii. 19. And in the history of the Acts we are informed, that Paul and Barnabas having travelled to Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, had been there employed in appointing, by suffrage, elders in every city, χειροτονησαντες αυτοις πρεσβυτερους κατ' εκκλησιαν, Acts xiv. 23; a form of expression which intimates, that they referred it to the people to choose their own presbyters or pastors, in whose ordination they assisted.†

Before we dismiss the consideration of the Levites, it will be proper to take notice of the place of their ordinary residence, and of their subsistence.

* Aristophan. in Εκκλησ. p. 371. Vid. Suiceri Thesaur. in verb. χειροτονια, who quotes Demosthenes and Æschines, to show that this Attic custom was expressed by the word χειροτονια. Vid. etiam Constantini Lexicon in verb. χειροτονεω, et χειροτονια.

† Vid. Witsii Maletem. de Vitâ Pauli, sect. iii. paragr. xx. p. 53—55.

As to their residence, they, as well as the priests, were precluded by the law from sharing the promised inheritance of Canaan with their brethren of the other tribes, Deut. xviii. 1, 2: "The priests, the Levites, and all the tribe of Levi, shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel; they shall have no inheritance among their brethren." The meaning is, they were to have no tract of land separately allotted to them as a tribe, in the same manner as the other tribes had; but in lieu of that, they had forty-eight cities with their suburbs assigned them out of the other tribes, thirteen of which belonged to the priests, and thirty-five to the rest of the tribe of Levi; Numb. xxxv. 1—8; Josh. xxi. It may be observed, that the cities of the priests were, for the most part, in the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, and consequently nearer to Jerusalem, which stood in the confines of these two tribes; whereas those of the Levites were divided to them by lot out of the other tribes on either side Jordan. And thus God converted Jacob's curse on Levi, which we spoke of before, into a national blessing, by dispersing the priests and Levites, whose office it was to preserve and teach knowledge, throughout the whole land. Dr. Lightfoot makes these forty-eight cities to be so many universities, where the ministerial tribe studied the law, and diffused the knowledge of it through the nation.* Of these, six were appointed cities of refuge, for protecting of persons from the rigour of the law, in case of involuntary homicide, of which we shall discourse in its proper place. The Levitical cities had suburbs and fields surrounding them, to the extent of three thousand cubits on every side: "The suburbs of the cities, which ye shall give unto the Levites, shall reach from the wall of the city and outward a thousand cubits round about; and ye shall measure from without the city on the east side two thousand cubits, on the south side two thousand cubits, on the west side two thousand cubits, on the north side two thousand cubits; and the city shall be in the midst. This shall be to them the suburbs of the cities;" Numb. xxxv. 4, 5. To reconcile the seeming contradiction between the thousand and two thousand cubits, Junius supposes the latter number expresses the diameter of the suburbs, the city being ab-

* See his chorographical century of the land of Israel, chap. xcvii.

stracted, from out to out. So that the whole territory belonging to the city reached no farther than a thousand cubits.* But Dr. Lightfoot follows the more probable opinion of Maimonides;† namely, that the former thousand cubits were for suburbs, more properly so called; for out-houses, barns, stables, &c.; and, it may be, for gardens of herbs and flowers: and the latter two thousand were for fields and vineyards,‡ which are called the "fields of the suburbs," Lev. xxv. 34. From the produce of these fields and vineyards arose some part of the subsistence of the priests and Levites, when they were not in waiting at the sanctuary; for in the weeks of their attendance they were maintained by the dues arising from the sacrifices: as the apostle observes, "Do ye not know, that they who minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple; and they who wait at the altar, are partakers of the altar?" 1 Cor. ix. 13. Beside these dues, the first-fruits, which were brought to the temple, and the money paid for the redemption of the first-born, contributed toward their subsistence. But when they were out of waiting, their maintenance partly, as we have said, arose from the glebes belonging to their cities; but chiefly from the tithes of the produce of the whole country, which the law allotted to the tribe of Levi: "Behold," saith God, "I have given the children of Levi all the tenth in Israel for an inheritance, for their service which they serve;" Numb. xviii. 21. This tithe the people paid both from the animal and vegetable produce of their estates; from the seed of the lands, and the fruit of the trees; from the sheep and black cattle; Lev. xxvii. 30; 2 Chron. xxxi. 5, 6. It was paid immediately to the Levites,

* Junius in loc.

† Lightfoot, ubi supra, ab init.; vid. etiam Mishn. Sotah, cap. v. sect. iii.; Maimon. et Bartenora in loc. tom. iii. p. 248, edit. Surenhus.

‡ Mr. Lowman understands the thousand cubits to be the measurement of the suburbs every way from the walls of the city into the country; and the two thousand cubits, the measurement from the beginning of the suburbs on the country side into the centre of the city. See his Civil Government of the Hebrews, p. 110. It is remarkable that the Septuagint reads two thousand in both places. And both Josephus and Philo mention only two thousand. Joseph. Antiq. lib. iv. cap. iv. sect. iii. tom. i. p. 204, edit. Havercamp. et Philo de Sacerdotum Honoribus, sub finem, p. 645, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

who probably received it, either on the spot where it was produced, or, at least, in their several cities; Nehem. x. 37. Out of this tithe the Levites paid a tenth part to the priests, Numb. xviii. 25—28, which is called their תרומה *terumah*, or heave-offering, as we render it, to the Lord; in like manner as the general tithe, paid by the people, is called their תרומה *terumah*, ver. 24. Not that we are to suppose all their tithes were lifted up toward heaven, as were some of the oblations, in token of their desire that God might accept them; but because they were so far of the same nature with the things offered to God by that rite, as to be separated and set apart for his use and service. In which sense all the offerings, or free donations to God, required for building him a sanctuary, are called תרומה *terumah*, Exod. xxv. 2; which the Chaldee Paraphrase translates, "that which is supported."

Besides this tithe, which the people were to pay to the Levites, they were also to tithe the remaining nine parts, and of that tithe to make a feast, to be kept in the court of the sanctuary, or in some apartment belonging to it; or in case they lived so remote, that they could not with convenience carry this tithe thither in kind, they might sell it, and purchase provisions with the money when they came to the sanctuary; only adding a fifth part thereto: Deut. xii. 17, 18; chap. xiv. 22—27; Lev. xxvii. 31. At this feast, which was kept in token of their thankfulness to God, for his providential bounties, they were to entertain, not only their own families and friends, but also the Levites. It is not expressly said how many of them were to be invited; that was left to prudence, and to be determined by the quantity of provisions; only in general the law is, "Thou shalt eat there before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thy household, and the Levite that is within thy gate; thou shalt not forsake him." Now that this tithe was different from that paid to the Levites is manifest, first, in that the tithe paid to them was for their own use; whereas this was consumed by the owners and their friends; only they were to invite some Levites to the feast. Secondly, That tithe was paid all the country over, this only at the sanctuary. Thirdly, The Levites were to pay a tenth of their tithe to the priests, which

they could not do of this, having no property in it, except that they were to partake of it as invited guests.

Besides these two tithes, Josephus,* and the apocryphal book, Tobit, chap. i. 8, speak of a third, paid once in three years; which was given away in charity. And some Jewish writers, therefore, call it the poor man's tithe.† This opinion may seem to receive some countenance from the express order in the book of Deuteronomy, that at the end of every three years they should bring forth all the tithe of their increase, and lay it up within their gates; that the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, as well as the Levite, might come, and eat, and be satisfied; Deut. xiv. 28, 29. Nevertheless, several learned Jews and Christians conceive this was not a distinct tithe, but the same with the second, with only this difference, that whereas, for two years together, the feast that was made by it, was kept at the sanctuary, the third year it was kept by the owners at their own house, in order that such of their poor neighbours and friends, as were aged and infirm, and could not travel to the place of the sanctuary, might not be wholly excluded from this thanksgiving-feast; or, as Mr. Mede expresses it, for two years together they paid the Levites' tithe, and the festival tithe; but, in the third year, they paid the Levites' tithe, and the poor man's tithe; that is, what was wont in other years to be spent in feasting, was every third year spent upon the poor.‡ But I acknowledge, that this third year's being called "the year of tithing," in the twenty-sixth chapter of Deuteronomy, ver. 12, seems to me to import, that some additional tithe was paid that year.

The reason of God's commanding this tithe to be paid to the priests and Levites was manifestly for their subsistence. For as they had no estates in land, like the other tribes, except only in their cities, and a few little fields about them; they must have starved without some such contribution from the other tribes. But why God would have them supported in this way, rather than by assigning them an inheritance,

* Antiq. lib. iv. cap. viii. sect. xxii. p. 238, edit. Haverc.

† Maimon. de Jure Pauperis, cap. vi. sect. i. p. 60, edit. Prideaux, Oxon. 1679.

‡ See Mede's Works, book i. disc. xxxiii. p. 171, 172; and likewise Selden on Tithes, chap. ii. sect. iii.

like the rest of the tribes; and why this proportion of a tenth was to be paid them, rather than any other, are questions not so easy to be resolved.

As to the former query, why God would have the priests and Levites supported by tithes, rather than by alloting them an inheritance in land, it was, no doubt, partly, that their time might not be taken up with secular business, and their minds burthened about worldly cares and managing their estates, and that they might employ themselves wholly in the duties of their office; as Timothy is exhorted by St. Paul, "to give himself wholly to his ministry;" and, for that end, cautioned against "entangling himself with the affairs of this life:" 1 Tim. iv. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 4.

Again, God's commanding the other Israelites to pay tithe out of their estates to his priests and Levites, might be designed as an acknowledgment, that they had received their estates from his free gift, and held them by no other tenure but his bounty. In which view the tithes may be considered as a quit-rent, to be annually paid to the original proprietor of the land, who had conquered it for them, and put them in possession of it.* Paying it to the priests and Levites, his immediate servants and ministers, for their maintenance and support, was paying it to him; and as they held their estates by this tenure, a neglect or refusal was a forfeiture. To this effect is the observation of Rabbi Bechai† on the following words: "And thou shalt eat before the Lord the tithe of thy corn, of thy wine, and thy oil," &c.; Deut. xiv. 23. If, saith he, thou pay the tithe, then it is thy corn, &c.; if not, it is mine; as it is said in the prophecy of Hosea, "Therefore will I return and take away my corn in the time thereof, and my wine in the season thereof;" chap. ii. 9. For they for-

* When William the Conqueror parcelled out the lands of England, he reserved a certain small rent to be annually paid out of every estate to the Crown, as an acknowledgment, that it was received from, and held under him. This rent is paid to this day from all freehold estates, under the name of chief rent. Or if there be any estates that pay it not, it is because they have been purchased out of others, of which purchase it was made a condition that they should be clear of this incumbrance, those other estates paying it for them.

† See Patrick in loc.

feited the whole, who did not pay a tenth, the rent which God had reserved to himself.

As for the second question, why God appointed the proportion of a tenth rather than any other, the Jews generally say, it was because ten is a perfect number, almost all nations ending their account of simple numbers with it, and then beginning again with compound numbers; or, as others phrase it, this is the end of lesser numbers, and the beginning of greater; on which account it was looked upon as the most perfect, and therefore had in great regard. But this is too frivolous. Perhaps a more substantial reason may be drawn from the ancient laws and customs of most nations, of paying a tenth to their kings. Aristotle mentions it as an ancient law in Babylon;* and Dr. Spencer† observes, from a passage in Aristophanes, that it was the custom in Athens, though a commonwealth, for the people to pay a tenth to the magistracy. That this was reckoned a part of the *jus regum*, in the eastern countries, appears from hence, that among the other oppressions which Samuel tells the Israelites they might expect from a king, he mentions his demanding their tithes: "He will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants;" 1 Sam. viii. 15. Now, as we have shown before, the priests and Levites were properly the officers and ministers of state, under God, as king of Israel; and the Israelites paying through their hands one-tenth to him, was agreeable to the custom of almost all nations to pay one-tenth to their king. Tithes, then, are to be considered as an appendage to the Theocracy; and I apprehend it will be extremely difficult to prove, that Christian ministers have a divine right to demand them, from this circumstance of a constitution peculiar to the Jewish nation. Thus much concerning the priests and Levites.

The rabbies speak of another sort of ecclesiastical persons, termed אנשי מעמד *anshè mangnamidh, viri stationarii*,‡ stationary men; of whom we have no mention in Scripture.

* Aristot. Œconomic. lib. ii. sub fin.

† De Legibus Hebræor. lib. iii. cap. x. sect. i. tom. ii. p. 721, 722, edit. Chappelow.

‡ Vid. Maimon. de Apparatu Templi, cap. vi. per totum, p. 126, et seq. Crenii Fascic. Sexti.

Nevertheless, there is some probability in the account of the Jewish doctors, that there were men chosen out of the several tribes, as representatives to attend at the sacrifices offered for all Israel; the law requiring, that the persons for whom sacrifices were offered should be present at the offering: Lev. i. 3. 4; chap. iii. 2—8. Among the sacrifices offered for all Israel, or for the whole congregation, were the continual daily sacrifices, provided at the public charge; and extraordinary sacrifices, when, on account of the sin of any particular person or persons, any judgment of God lay upon the whole nation; as in the case of the Israelites being worsted by the Canaanites at Ai, on account of Achan's transgression: in such cases the law directed, that "the congregation should offer a young bullock for the sin, and burn him before the tabernacle of the congregation;" Lev. iv. 13, 14. On the annual fast, or day of expiation, there was likewise a solemn sacrifice of atonement offered for all Israel, "because of their transgressions, in all their sins;" Lev. xvi. 16. On such occasions, it being impossible that all the people should be present, there were representatives chosen, say the doctors, for the whole body; who, being divided into twenty-four courses, attended by rotation, as the priests and Levites did.

The Nethinim, who come next under consideration, were so called from נתן *nathan, dedit,* because they were given to the Levites for servants, or slaves, to do the drudgery belonging to the sacred service. Ezra says, they were given or appointed by David and the princes for the service of the Levites; chap. viii. 20. They were originally the Gibeonites, who obtaining a league of peace with the Israelites, soon after they came into Canaan, by artifice and fraud, were condemned by Joshua to the lowest and most laborious offices belonging to the service of the tabernacle; drawing water, fetching and cleaving wood for the fire of the altar, &c.; Josh. ix. 3, to the end.

We never find them called Nethinim before David's time; but afterwards, when the Israelites had enlarged their conquests, and probably added others of other nations to these vassals of the sanctuary, they were no longer called Gibeonites, but Nethinim, a name that would suit those of one nation as well as another. From this time they do not seem to have been considered and treated like slaves, but rather as

the lowest order of the servants of the sanctuary, having, no doubt, embraced the Jewish religion. At their return from the captivity they were placed in cities with the Levites: Nehem. xi. 3; Ezra ii. 70; 1 Chron. ix. 2. There were very few, indeed, that chose to return; probably, because of the lowness of their condition and station amongst the Israelites. We read of no more than two hundred and twenty, who came with Ezra, chap. viii. 20; and three hundred ninety-two with Zerubbabel; chap. ii. 58: a number so insufficient for the service-work of the temple, that Josephus tells us they instituted a festival, which they called ξυλοφορια, on which the people were obliged to carry a certain quantity of wood, to supply the altar of burnt-offerings.* The Papists have a sort of officers in imitation of the Nethinim, whom they call subdeacons; whose business it is to carry a bason of water, and a towel, to the priests who minister at the altar, to wash their hands before they celebrate mass.

Of the Sacrifices.

To this chapter, concerning the ministers of the sanctuary, may properly be subjoined a brief account of that part of its service, in which they were chiefly employed, namely, the sacrifices.

Of their first institution we have no certain information in Scripture. But they were practised, we find, in the first ages of the world by Cain and Abel, Gen. iv.; and by our first parents, probably, presently after the fall. For we read, that "unto Adam and to his wife the Lord made coats of skins, and clothed them;" Gen. iii. 21. As animal food was not used till after the flood, which we formerly proved,† we can-

* Joseph. de Bell. Judaic. lib. ii. cap. xvii. sect. vi. p. 194, edit. Haverc.

† Since we considered this subject, Dr. Sykes, in his late Essay on the Nature, Design, and Origin of Sacrifices, in order to explain the animal sacrifice which Abel offered, consistently with his own notion of sacrifices in general, namely, that they were a kind of eating and drinking with God as it were at his table, and in consequence of that being in a state of friendship with him by repentance and confession of sins (p. 120); hath endeavoured to show, in opposition to Grotius and Le Clerc, that animals were used for food before the flood. And as these authors think the express

not easily imagine whence they so soon procured these skins, probably before any creatures had died of themselves, unless from beasts slain for sacrifice.

grant of animal food made after the flood is sufficient proof that it was not in use before the flood, he inquires into the meaning of the respective grants to Adam and Noah (p. 167—178).

The former is in these words (Gen. i. 29, 30): "Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree bearing seed; to you it shall be for meat. And to every beast of the field, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, have I given every green herb for meat." And the Doctor, remarking, that this grant must necessarily be understood with some limitations, some creatures being not formed for living upon herbs, and some herbs being of a poisonous quality, infers from hence, that it was not intended to intimate, that this or that food was prohibited, and not to be eaten by man, but to declare in general, how well God had, in his infinite wisdom, provided for the numerous species of creatures which he had created. But I apprehend, that, if we should allow there were noxious vegetables before the fall, when this grant was made, it is not a very natural inference, that, because it was to be limited to those herbs that were salutary in their nature, it might for that reason be extended to animal food, of which kind of food there is not the least mention. It is a maxim, that permissive laws are to be restrained to those objects which are expressly declared in them, or at least to those which are of the same nature, and are evidently comprehended in the general ground and reason of the law.

With respect to the grant to Noah, "every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you, even as the green herb have I given you all things," Gen. ix. 3, he apprehends it does not imply any grant of animal food in general, but only of some particular sorts of it, such as are included in the word רמש *remesh*, here rendered "moving," which, according to him, signifieth creeping things, or such animals as are not comprehended under the words, beast and fowl. Consequently, whatever is the meaning of this grant, it may be consistent with men's eating sheep and oxen, goats, and the like animals, from the first. But this criticism is without foundation, for it is certain that רמש *remesh* is of very general signification, and used for all kinds of animals, or all that can move. As in the following passages: "All flesh died that moveth, הרמש *haromesh*, upon the face of the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of every beast and creeping thing;" Gen. vii. 21. Again, "God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, הרמש *haromesh*, which the waters bring forth abundantly," Gen. i. 21; that is, all kinds of fishes. When, therefore, God gave to Adam dominion over the fishes of the sea, and over the fowls of the air, and over every living thing that moveth, הרמשת *haromesheth*, upon the face of the earth, ver. 28; the רמש or רמשת *remesh*, or *remesheth*, cannot here be understood to denote a particular species

Whether men were led to the practice of sacrificing by their own reason, or by the command of God, hath been a matter of controversy both among Jews and Christians. Some of the Hebrew doctors are of the former opinion,* in which they are followed by Chrysostom; who saith, that Abel sacrificed the firstlings of his flock voluntarily, and from the motion of his own conscience, without any instruction or any positive law.† And the author of the questions and answers to the orthodox, in the works of Justin Martyr, asserts, that all who offered animals in sacrifice before the law of Moses, did it without any divine command; nevertheless, God accepted the offering, and was pleased with the offerer.‡ Grotius declares himself of the same opinion,§ and produces, among others, the following passages in support of it: the first out of the prophet Jeremy: "For I spake not unto your fathers, neither commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices;" Jer. vii. 22. Again, out of the Psalms, "I will not reprove thee for thy sacrifices, or thy burnt-offerings, to have been continually before me. I will take no bullock out of thy house, nor he-goats out of thy folds. Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God thanksgiving, and pay thy vows unto the Most High;" Psalm l. 8—14.

of animals different from fishes and fowls, but all sorts of animals, or any other that can move, as well as those particularly named.

The Doctor understands the latter clause, "the flesh with the blood, which is the life thereof, thou shalt not eat," to be only a prohibition of eating animals which died of themselves, and an injunction to kill before they eat. A prohibition and injunction, which, if men used animal food before the flood, seems difficult to be accounted for, unless upon supposition that it was their practice to feed on animals which died of themselves, and that they did not kill them for food; which is very unlikely, since it is certain, and Dr. Sykes admits, they killed them for sacrifice.

Upon the whole, therefore, notwithstanding all the Doctor hath advanced, I cannot see reason to depart from the opinion I before espoused, that there was no permission to eat animal food till after the flood.

* Maimonides, Rabbi Levi Ben Gerson, and Abarbanel; vid. Outram. de Sacrificiis, p. 9.

† Hom. xii. ad Popul. Antioch. tom. ii. edit. Benedict. p. 129.

‡ Respons. ad Quæst. lxxxiii. apud Opera Justin. p. 442, edit. Paris, 1615.

§ Vid. Annot. in Gen. iv. 3, et in Jerem. vii. 22, præcipue, de Veritat. Relig. Christ. lib. v. sect. viii.

And in another place, "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it. Thou delightest not in burnt-offerings;" Psalm li. 16. Once more, "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened. Burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required;" Psalm xl. 6. In all which passages, and some others that might be mentioned, the blessed God seems to speak with contempt of sacrifices, not only as unprofitable to him, but as if he did not command them. As for those in the Psalms, they must certainly be understood, either in a comparative sense, as importing that sacrifices were not so pleasing to him as moral obedience; or as expressing their insufficiency to make a proper atonement for sin; according to the apostle, "It is not possible, that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins," Heb. x. 4; and as reproving, therefore, the vain dependence of those who rested upon them for pardon and divine acceptance, without looking by faith to their great antitype, the sacrifice of Christ. It cannot be supposed the Psalmist meant that God had not instituted sacrifices, because we know he had done it long before his time, by Moses. But the passage in the prophet Jeremy, that God "spake not unto the fathers, nor commanded them, concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices," being said expressly to relate to a time prior to the giving of the law at Mount Sinai, namely, to the day of their deliverance out of the land of Egypt; it is from hence inferred, that he did not institute sacrifices before the promulgation of the law by Moses. This opinion is zealously patronized by the Papists, in favour of their will-worship, or appointing religious rites and ceremonies without any divine institution; for so, they allege, did the patriarchs in case of sacrifices; yet God approved, though he did not command them. The same notion is also embraced by some Protestants, in order to evade the argument drawn from the typical sacrifices of atonement, to prove the death of Christ a proper expiatory sacrifice. Sacrifices, they plead, were at first a human institution, and to prevent their being offered to idols, God condescended to the introducing them into his service; not that he approved them as good in themselves, or as proper rites of worship. However, those who apprehend that sacrifices were originally of divine institution, reply,—

1st. That Abel is said to have "offered his sacrifice by faith," Heb. xi. 4; which must imply, as its ground and foundation, some divine promise connected with that rite, and consequently a divine direction for the performance of it.

Dr. Spencer maintains, that sacrifices were originally considered under the notion of gifts, the effect of which in appeasing the anger and conciliating the favour of men being observed, it was supposed they would have the like effect with God, and thereupon was invented the rite of sacrificing.*

But to this it may be replied, that if both Cain and Abel sacrificed upon this principle, which must be acknowledged to be a wrong one, it will be hard to account for God's accepting the one, and rejecting the other. Besides, as Dr. Kennicott very justly observes, the opinion, that sacrifices would prevail with God, must proceed from an observation, that gifts had prevailed with men; an observation, which Cain and Abel had little opportunity of making.† Not to insist on what he further urges, that gifts could not have been in use till property was established; which it probably‡ was not in the days of Cain and Abel.

2dly. The paschal lamb was expressly instituted by God himself, not only before the giving the law at Sinai, but before the migration of the Israelites from Egypt; and that this was a real sacrifice is certain, it being called "the sacrifice of the Lors p assover," Exod. xii. 27; and it being elsewhere said, "Thou shalt sacrifice the passover unto the Lord thy God," Deut. xvi. 2; see also ver. 5, 6. Again, Christ, under the notion of our "Passover," is declared "to be sacrificed for us;" 1 Cor. v. 7. When therefore it is said in Jeremiah, that "God did not speak unto the fathers concerning sacrifices in the day that he brought them out of Egypt," it cannot mean that he had yet instituted no sacrifices at all. Again, farther,

3dly. If we consider how highly God hath resented, and how severely he hath punished will-worship in other cases; particularly with respect to Nadab and Abihu's burning in-

* Spencer de Legibus Hebræor. lib. iii. dissert. ii. cap. iii. sect. i. ii. tom. ii. p. 762, 763. In the next chapter he attempts to prove at large, that sacrifices were of human origin, and not of divine institution.

† Two Dissert. on the Tree of Life, and Oblations of Cain and Abel, p. 206.

‡ Ibid. Append. p. 252—254.

cense with strange fire, which the Lord commanded them not, on which they were struck dead on the spot, Lev. x. 1, 2; one cannot surely suppose, he would have so highly approved of the patriarchs' sacrificing, as he did, if he had not commanded it.

When God, therefore, saith, in the words so often cited, "I spake not unto the fathers, nor commanded them, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices," it must be taken in connexion with the words immediately following, "But this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people; and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded" (rather, shall command you), "that it may be well unto you;" and then, with Rabbi Solomon Jarchi, and Maimonides, we may understand,—

1st. That after God had brought Israel out of Egypt, he did not first speak to them, and command them, concerning sacrificial rites, but concerning moral obedience. For the beginning of the law they date from the Israelites coming to Marah, three days after they had left the Red Sea, where "God made a statute and an ordinance, and where he proved them, and said, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians;" Exod. xv. 25, 26. And this being before the new institution of sacrifices at mount Sinai, they were in fact not first commanded concerning these, but concerning moral obedience.* So that these Jewish doctors understand the form of expression in Jeremy, as we must that of St. Paul, "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression," 1 Tim. ii. 14; that is, Adam was not first deceived, and was not first in the transgression, but Eve.

2dly. These words may be very well understood in a comparative sense: "God did not command the fathers concerning sacrifices, but this he commanded them, to obey his voice;" that is, he did not command them concerning sacrifices, so

* Maimon. More Nevoch. part. iii. cap. xxxii. p. 436, Buxtorf. Basil. 1629.

much as concerning moral obedience; "to obey being better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams;" 1 Sam. xv. 22. Accordingly, God is said to desire mercy, and not sacrifice, Hos. vi. 6; or mercy rather than sacrifice. In this manner negatives are frequently used for comparatives: "It was not you that sent me hither, but God," Gen. xlv. 8; not so much you, as God. "Your murmurings are not against us, but against the Lord," Exod. xvi. 8; not so properly against us, as the Lord. "Labour not for the meat that perisheth, but for the meat which endureth to everlasting life," John vi. 27; that is, not with so much assiduity and anxiety for the former, as for the latter.

Upon the whole, then, it is most probable, sacrifices were first instituted by God himself, and enjoined our first parents presently after the fall; from whom, and afterward from Noah, all nations received them by tradition.*

However, in process of time these, as well as all the other branches of religious faith and worship, were miserably corrupted; instead of brute animals which God had appointed, human sacrifices grew into use, and it became no uncommon thing, in several countries, for parents to sacrifice their children. And besides this change, as to the subjects of the sacrifices, the objects of them were likewise altered; the Gentiles "sacrificing to demons, and not to God;" 1 Cor. x. 20. When, therefore, God chose Israel to be his peculiar people and church, among whom he would revive the true religion, he gave them, anew, his law concerning sacrifices, with the addition of such particular rites as would make them more significant types of good things to come under the gospel dispensation. For instance, whereas formerly the head of every family was, probably, the sacrificer for his own household, God now appointed a peculiar order of priests, with their assistants the Levites, whose whole business it should be to attend the sacrifices; by whom, therefore, they would be more regularly performed, and better preserved from being corrupted, than in times past. It is

* Against the human, and for the divine institution of sacrifices, see the ingenious and learned Dr. Kennicott's two Dissertations on the Tree of Life, and the Oblations of Cain and Abel, p. 201, et seq.; Witsii Miscell. tom. i. lib. ii. dissert. ii. sect. i.—xv. Dr. Outram hath discussed the arguments on both sides without determining on either, De Sacrificiis, lib. i. cap. i. sect. iii. iv. p. 2—11.

concerning these new instituted Jewish sacrifices we are now more especially to discourse.

The general name sometimes includes all the offerings made to God, or any way devoted to his service and honour. Thus, not only offerings of fruits, as well as animals, are called sacrifices; but likewise the moral duties of repentance, thanksgiving, and praise: "The sacrifices of God are a broken and a contrite spirit;" Psalm li. 17. Again, "I will offer unto thee the sacrifice of thanksgiving;" Psalm cxvi. 17. And, "Let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God;" Heb. xiii. 15.

But, in a stricter sense, sacrifices and offerings were two things; every sacrifice, indeed, was an offering, but every offering not a sacrifice. All sorts of tithes, and first-fruits, and whatever of their worldly substance was consecrated to God, for the support of his worship, and the maintenance of his ministers, were offerings, or oblations. These were either of living creatures, or other things; as corn, flour, wine, oil, &c. But sacrifices, in the more peculiar sense of the term, were of living creatures; of which only five sorts were prescribed, or allowed by the law; three of beasts, namely, bullocks, sheep, or goats; and two of birds, that is, doves and turtles. Beasts only were allowed in public sacrifices, and birds in private ones; and that chiefly when persons were too poor to provide a more costly sacrifice.

The general design and use of such offerings and sacrifices was partly,—

1st. As an acknowledgment of their receiving all their good things from the hand of God, and of his right in the whole of that of which they offered him a part: though to make this act the more significant and expressive, it was a part of almost every thing they had.

2dly. To be a means of repentance and humiliation for sin, of the desert of which they were reminded by the suffering and death of the victim, substituted in their room, and suffering in their stead.

3dly. To typify, and so to assist their faith in that promised sacrifice of atonement, which the Son of God was to offer in due time. There was also a political use of many of these sacrifices, which we have formerly taken notice of. Dr. Sykes*

* Essay on the Nature, Design, and Origin of Sacrifices, p. 59.

makes all sacrifices to be federal rites, which implied men's entering into friendship with God; or if they had violated their friendship with him, then they denoted reconciliation, and a renewal of that friendship. He supposes the fire on the altar represented God, who was anciently wont to manifest himself in a shechinah, or flame; as he did to Moses in the bush, and in the holy of holies in the Jewish tabernacle.* And accordingly, those sacrifices, part of which was consumed on the altar, and part eat by the offerers, signified their being in friendship with God, and their desire of continuing so; eating and drinking together being an ancient rite, and token of friendship among men. And the whole burnt-offering, in which all was given to God, being consumed on his altar, signified their desire of reconciliation and renewed friendship with him; and their acknowledgment of their unworthiness of it, as they eat of no part of the sacrifice.†

But as for the notion of the victim's being substituted, to suffer death and be consumed in the room and stead of the transgressor, for whom it was offered, the Doctor allows it to have been ancient, and commonly received among Gentiles and Jews, as well as Christians.‡ Thus Ovid, in the sixth book of his Fasti, supposes the sacrificed animal to be a vicarious substitute, the several parts of which were given as equivalents for what was due by the offerers:

> Cor pro corde, precor; pro fibra sumite fibras;
> Hanc animam vobis pro meliore damus.

Abarbanel espouses the same sentiment in his Introduction to his Comment on Leviticus:§ "The person," saith he, "that put his hand upon the head of the beast, by this rite confessed the desert of his sins, and declared the blood of that animal to be shed in lieu of his own; and that it was just and right that the offender's life should be taken away, as was that of the beast brought to the altar." And Dr. Outram‖ abundantly shows, that it was the common opinion of the rabbies, "that the blood of the sinner in equity ought to have been poured

* Essay on the Nature, Design, and Origin of Sacrifices, p. 337.

† Ibid. p. 232, 233. 277. ‡ Ibid. p. 121.

§ Abarbanel. Exord. Comment. in Levit. ad calcem Maimon. de Sacrificiis per Du Viel, p. 301.

‖ Outram. de Sacrificiis, lib. i. cap. xxii. sect. v.—xii. p. 269—278.

out, and his body burnt, as was the blood of the victim poured out and its body burnt, and that God in his mercy and goodness took the victim instead of, and as an expiation for, the offender." Thus they understand a translation of sin upon the head of the victim, and likewise of the punishment due to the offender. Dr. Sykes utterly rejects this notion of sacrifices being vicarious and expiatory, and endeavours to confute it with the following arguments :—

1st. It is not anywhere expressly said, or so much as hinted, in the Old Testament, that the victim's life was given in lieu of, or as a vicarious substitute for, the life of him that offered it."* To this we answer,

There was no need of its being expressly said, it being well known and universally understood to be the true intent and meaning of killing the victim. Of this fact numerous testimonies might be added to those already cited, from the most ancient writers of several nations. It is strange he should say it is not so much as hinted in the Old Testament, where there are so many cases, in which a person having done something, that, according to the law, forfeited his life, upon a victim's being slain and sacrificed for him, whereby an atonement was made for his transgression, the forfeiture was reversed, and thereupon his life was spared. However, this notion is expressly advanced in the New Testament, in relation to the death of Christ, which is said to be "an offering and sacrifice to God," Eph. v. 2; and he is said to have "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself," Heb. ix. 26; and to have suffered for sins, the just for the unjust," 1 Pet. iii. 18; and to have died for us in the same sense that one man may die for another, that is, to save the other from dying by suffering death in his stead; Rom. v. 6—8. And this is founded on the supposition, that the victim's life was given in lieu of, or as a vicarious substitute for, the person for whom it was offered.

2dly. The Doctor pleads, that in some cases, atonement was made for sin without any animal sacrifice, and without any life being given; therefore, piacular sacrifice did not imply giving life for life.† Thus, when a poor man, who could not be at the expense of an animal sacrifice, had forfeited his life

* Essay on Sacrifices, p. 122. † P. 123—126.

by some transgression of the law, he was indulged with offering a handful of fine flour only, and with that the "priest was to make atonement for the offender, as touching his sin that he had sinned;" Lev. v. 13.

I reply, This by no means proves, that when an animal piacular sacrifice was offered, it did not imply giving life for life. It only shows God might, if he pleased, accept of a lower atonement for the forfeited life of the offender. And it is a remarkable instance of his compassionate indulgence to the poor, that he would accept of some flour only, to be burnt and destroyed on his altar, as a vicarious substitute for those lives or persons who deserved to be destroyed.

3dly. The Doctor argues, that if the design of animal sacrifices had been to give life for life, mactation alone would have been sufficient; and there would have been no occasion for the subsequent rite of burning the blood upon the altar, that was to attend it.* To this we reply,

If the only end and design of piacular sacrifices had been to give life for life, there might have been some weight in this argument. But as the transgressor of God's law had not only forfeited his natural life, but had incurred future punishment, it made the sacrifice more properly and significantly vicarious, that, after it was killed, the flesh should be burnt with fire, and utterly consumed on the altar. And as for the מנחה *minchah*, or meat-offering, that was to attend it and be consumed along with it, it might naturally signify the forfeiture of their substance as well as their lives, into the hands of divine justice.

4thly. The Doctor observes, that no where, in the books that particularly mention the institution of sacrifices, or largely treat about them, or in the versions of them, are they ever called *λυτρα*, *αντιλυτρα*, or *αντιψυχα*, equivalents, compensations, exchanges, substitutes, or by any other word which implies giving life for life.† I answer,

We are not much concerned what word the Septuagint, or any other version, hath used for sacrifices. But since the Doctor seems to allow, that if they were called *λυτρα*, or *αντιλυτρα*, that would imply their vicarious substitution; I think it a substantial argument, that they really were so, that the

* P. 126—134. † P. 134, 135.

death of Christ, which is expressly said to be a sacrifice for the sins of men, is said to be a λυτρον, Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45; and αντιλυτρον, 1 Tim. ii. 6. That no word is used in the books that mention the "institution of sacrifices, or so largely treat about them, which implies giving life for life," is positively asserted; and if we should assert, that the Hebrew word נשא *nasa*, *portavit*, *sustinuit*, which is so often used concerning piacular sacrifices, does naturally and strictly imply this, I am persuaded we should have reason and truth on our side. As this word is used for men's bearing their own sin, that is, suffering the punishment of it in their own persons, Lev. xxiv. 15; Numb. xiv. 34, *et alibi;* and for one man's bearing the sins of another, that is, suffering the punishment which the other's sins had deserved, Ezek. xviii. 20; so it is also used for the sin-offering, which is said to "bear the iniquity of the congregation, and to make atonement for them before the Lord," Lev. x. 17: where, to bear the iniquity of the congregation, and to make atonement for their sins, are plainly the same thing; and to bear the iniquity of the congregation, according to the common use of the word נשא *nasa*, is to suffer the legal result of their iniquity, or, which comes to the same, a vicarious death and punishment for them. And thus Christ is said to have "borne our griefs and carried our sorrows," Isa. liii. 4, and to "bear the sins of many," ver. 12. Once more,

5thly. The Doctor observes, that atonement is required to be made by animal sacrifices, in some cases, where there was no crime committed, and therefore no life forfeited.* A woman after child-bearing is commanded to bring a lamb, or, if not able to do that, two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, "the one for a burnt-offering, the other for a sin-offering; and the priest should make an atonement for her;" Lev. xii. 8. Again, certain animal sacrifices are appointed for the cleansing of a leper, Lev. xiv. 10—21, by which the priest was to make "an atonement for him;" ver. 21. From these two cases the Doctor argues, that, as in neither of them any crime is supposed to be committed, nor life forfeited, therefore no vicarious death and punishment could be supposed to be inflicted on the victim; and consequently, the common notion of a

* P. 135—141.

substitution in piacular sacrifices, which has so much prevailed in the world, does not at all enter into the Scripture notion of making atonement.

But here I would ask, if those persons for whom atonement was made were not guilty of sin, why was any atonement made for them; since the Doctor himself tells us, that "to make atonement for sins, is to do something, by means of which a man obtains the pardon of them."* We allow the woman had not properly contracted guilt by her child-bearing, nor the leper by his disease; but, as the pains of child-bearing, and as all diseases to which the human body is incident (of which leprosy, according to the account travellers give of it, in the eastern countries, seems to be the most grievous), are the fruits and consequences of the apostacy, and of sin, which hath brought these calamities on human nature, it was highly proper, that, on occasion of a deliverance from these remarkable effects of sin, there should be an humble acknowledgment made of the desert of it in general, and a piacular sacrifice offered for original and for all actual transgressions; which I take to be the intent of such sacrifices on these occasions.

Upon the whole, then, I see no reason, from any of Dr. Sykes's arguments, to depart from the ancient doctrine, which hath so universally approved itself to the reason of Gentiles as well as Jews; namely, that in sacrifices of expiation and atonement for sin, there was a substitution of the victim to suffer in the room and stead of the transgressor.

Sacrifices are distinguished by the Jewish writers into the most holy, and into those of an inferior kind, or less holy.† Of the former sort were the burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, and peace-offerings, of the whole congregation; of the latter, they reckon the peace-offering of particular persons, paschal lambs, firstlings, and tenths. Some of them distinguish them also into sacrifices of duty, to which they were bound by the law, and voluntary sacrifices, which they offered of their own free will.‡

* P. 306.

† Mishn. tit. Zebachim, cap. v. sect. i. et vii. p. 21 et 25, tom v. edit. Surenhus.; Maimon. de Ratione Sacrificiorum faciendorum, cap. i. sect. xvii. p. 290, Crenii Fascic. Sexti.

‡ Vid. Reland. Antiq. Veterum Hebræor. part. iii. cap. i. sect. iii. p. 291, 292, 3d. edit. Traject. Bat. 1717.

Whatever was offered in sacrifice was to be good and perfect in its kind; no beast that had any distemper, blemish, or defect, was allowed.

In treating of this subject, we shall distinguish sacrifices in respect,

1st. To their signification and use:

2dly. To the persons that offered them: and,

3dly. To the subject-matter of them.

1st. In respect to their signification and use, they are distinguished into four kinds—burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, and peace-offerings.*

1st. The first and most ancient sort of sacrifices were burnt-offerings, which the Hebrews call עולות *gnoloth*, from עלה *gnalah, ascendit;* the Greeks, ὁλοκαυστα, from ὁλος, *totus*, and καιω, *uro;* because they were wholly consumed with fire, except the skin, and so made to ascend in flames and smoke from the altar. Sacrifices of this sort are often mentioned by the Heathens† as well as Jews; particularly by Xenophon, who speaks of sacrificing holocausts of oxen to Jupiter, and of horses to the sun.‡ They appear to have been in use long before the institution of the other Jewish sacrifices by the law of Moses. Abel's was most probably of that sort. However, we expressly read of burnt-offerings in Job's time, chap. i. 5; xlii. 8; and in Abraham's, Gen. xxii. 13; and as early as Noah, who, upon his coming out of the ark, "built an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings upon the altar;" Gen. viii. 20.

Hence it was, that though the Jews would not allow the Gentiles to offer on their altar any other sacrifices peculiarly enjoined by the law of Moses, yet they admitted them by the hands of the Jewish priests to offer holocausts, this being a

* This division is said by Maimonides and Abarbanel to comprehend every kind of sacrifices that the law prescribes, whether public or private. Vid. Maimon. de Ratione Sacrificiorum faciendorum, cap. i. sect. ii. p. 283, Crenii Fascic. Sexti; et R. Abarbanel. Exord. Comment. in Levit. cap. ii. p. 243, ad calcem Maimon. de Sacrificiis, per Du Viel; see likewise Maimon. Præfat. ad Quintam Partem Mishnæ, fol. 1.

† Outram. de Sacrificiis, lib. i. cap. x. sect. ix. p. 113.

‡ Εθυσαν τῳ Δι, και ὡλοκαυτωσαν τους ταυρους· επειτα τῳ Ἡλιῳ, και ὡλοκαυτωσαν τους ἱππους, Cyropæd. lib. viii. p. 464, edit. Hutchins. 1738.

sort of sacrifices prior to the law, and common to all nations.* During their subjection to the Romans, it was no uncommon thing for those Gentiles to offer sacrifices to the God of Israel at Jerusalem. There is a letter of king Agrippa to Caius in Philo's works, in which it was said, that the emperor Augustus ordered a holocaust of two lambs and a bullock to be offered for him daily, τῷ ὑψιστῳ Θεῳ, to the Most High God, at Jerusalem.† And hence Tertullian, in his apology to the Romans, says, "cujus (Judææ sc.) et Deum victimis, et templum donis, et gentem fœderibus, aliquandiu honorastis."‡

The Jews accounted their holocaust the most excellent of all their sacrifices. Accordingly it is so styled by Philo, in his book *de Victimis*, who begins with it, and assigns this reason for giving it the preference, that it redounds solely to the divine honour, being entirely consumed with fire, and leaving therefore no room for selfishness or avarice.§ Moses likewise begins the law concerning sacrifices with those relating to the holocaust or burnt-offering, Lev. i. *initio;* and informs us, that the creatures proper for sacrifices were bullocks, sheep, or goats, and turtle doves-or young pigeons; ver. 5. 10. 14. The doves and pigeons were chiefly for the poorer sort of people, who could not go to the price of bullocks and sheep. The law enjoins a person who had been guilty in some articles particularly specified, "to bring his trespass-offering unto the Lord, a female from the flock, a lamb or a kid of the goats, for a sin-offering; but if he be not able to bring a lamb, then two turtle doves or two young pigeons, one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering; Lev. v. 6, 7. And in like manner a woman, after child-bearing, is ordered to bring a lamb for a burnt-offering, and a dove or a pigeon for a sin-offering; but if she be not able to bring a lamb, she shall bring two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, the one for a burnt-offering, the other for a sin-offering; Lev. xii. 6. 8. It is observable, that the poor woman's offering

* Maimon. de Ratione Sacrificiorum faciendorum, cap. iii. sect. ii. p. 300, Crenii Fascic. Sexti.

† De Legatione ad Caium, apud Opera, p. 801, E. edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

‡ Tertullian. Apolog. sect. xxvi. p. 26, edit. Rigalt. 1675.

§ Apud Opera, p. 648, B. C. edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

was that which the Virgin Mary made at her purification; Luke ii. 24.

The burnt-offering, as I said, was entirely consumed by fire: "It is the burnt-offering, because of the burning upon the altar all night until the morning, and the fire of the altar shall be burning in it;" Lev. vi. 9. Only the skin was the priest's due for the trouble of performing the sacrifice;" chap. vii. 8. It is disputed among the Jewish doctors on what accounts the holocausts were offered. Some say, to expiate all evil thoughts, as sin-offerings and trespass-offerings all evil actions. Others say, to atone for the breach of affirmative precepts, as the latter did for that of negative ones.*

Some Christian writers make the holocaust to be offered to God as an acknowledgment of his being the Creator, Lord, and Preserver of all, worthy of all honour and worship; and likewise as a token or emblem of men's giving themselves up entirely to him, as they did the victim, which was wholly consumed on the altar. Accordingly it is supposed the apostle alludes to the holocaust, when he exhorts us to "present our bodies," or ourselves, "a living sacrifice to God;" Rom. xii. 1.

But farther, since the end of the offering was always to make atonement, as is declared in the general law concerning burnt-offerings, Lev. i. 4, which yet it could not do absolutely and properly, Heb. x. 1—4. 11; it must, therefore, be understood to do it typically, or in a way of representation. And this was, doubtless, its grand intention and use, even to typify, and to direct the faith of the Old Testament believers to that only true atoning sacrifice, which the Son of God was to offer in due time. Hence Christ is said to have "offered up his body once for all," that is, his whole self, his entire human nature; ver. 8—10. I have only farther to observe, that of this kind was the continual sacrifice offered every morning and evening, which, it was predicted, the Messiah should cause to cease, Dan. ix. 27, and with the abolition of which, the Jewish worship and church was brought to a final period.

2dly. The next kind of sacrifices were the חטאת *chattaoth*, or sin-offerings, the law and rites of which are laid down and described in the fourth chapter of Leviticus. The verb חטא

* Outram. de Sacrificiis, lib. i. cap. x. sect. vii. p. 111.

chata, in *kal*, signifies to sin; and hence חטאים *chattaim* signifies sinners; Psalm i. 1. But, in *pihel*, it has a different signification, namely, to cleanse, expiate, make atonement, or satisfaction: "That which was torn," saith Jacob to Laban, "I brought it not to thee;" אחטנה *achattenna*, I bore the loss of it; I made satisfaction for it; Gen. xxxi. 39. Hence the noun חטאה *chattaah*, is used to denote an offering for sin, whereby pardon is procured, atonement is made, and sin is expiated. In the same sense the apostle Paul uses the Greek word ἁμαρτια, in imitation, I suppose, of the Hebrew phraseology, "Him that knew no sin, ὑπερ' ἡμων ἁμαρτιαν εποιησεν, he hath made a sin-offering for us;" 2 Cor. v. 21. And so the apostle renders the following words of the Psalmist, עולה וחטאה *gnolah vachattaah*, Psalm xl. 6, Ὁλοκαυτωματα και περι ἁμαρτιας, "burnt-offerings, and sin-offerings;" Heb. x. 6. Thus περι ἁμαρτιας ought undoubtedly to be rendered, where it is said, "God sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, και περι ἁμαρτιας, and, by a sin-offering, condemned sin in the flesh;" Rom. viii. 3.

According to the Scripture account, these sacrifices were offered,

1st. For all sins of ignorance or inadvertency against what are commonly called the negative precepts, or with respect to things forbidden. The case stated in Leviticus is, "If a soul shall sin, through ignorance, against any of the commandments of the Lord, concerning things which ought not to be done, and shall do against any of them." Notwithstanding this general mode of expression, the rabbies limit the law to those sins of ignorance, which, if they had been committed knowingly and wilfully, would have incurred the penalty of "cutting off;" and they tell us they were forty-three in number, which they pretend exactly to enumerate.* But the words are express against this rabbinical restriction, "If a soul shall sin through ignorance, מכול מצות *miccol mitsoth*, against any of the commandments of the Lord;" Lev. iv. 2, 3. 13, 14. 22, 23. 27, 28. Besides, we find these sacrifices enjoined in cases where the penalty of being "cut off" could not be incurred; particularly,

* Maimon. de Sacrificiis, tractat. iv. cap. i. sect. ii.—iv. Du Viel, Lond. 1683.

2dly. On occasion of legal pollution; as at the cleansing of a leper, Lev. xiv. 19, and the purification of a woman after child-bearing, chap. xii. 6, and other legal pollutions, specified in the fifteenth chapter of Leviticus, ver. 19. 29, 30.

In the common sin-offering, whether private or public, the fat only was burnt upon the altar, and part of the blood put on the horns of the altar, and part of it poured at the foot of it; chap. iv. 25, 26. But the flesh was the due of the priest, to be eaten in the courts of the tabernacle of the congregation, chap. vi. 25, 26; and by these, and by the trespass-offerings, were the priests chiefly maintained in the weeks of their attendance on the temple service. Besides many particular occasions, on which these sacrifices were offered, there were also constant sin-offerings at stated seasons, as on every new moon a kid of the goats, Numb. xxviii. 15; and on the fifteenth day of the passover month, one goat, and so for seven days successively, ver. 22. 24; on the day of the feasts of trumpets, a kid, chap. xxix. 5; and at the feast of tabernacles, a kid for seven days together, ver. 7. 11, *et seq.*

There were also sin-offerings of a more solemn nature, offered on extraordinary occasions, of which the priests had no part, but they were entirely consumed with fire; not, however, on the altar, as the holocausts were, but without the camp, or upon the ground in the open field; only the kidneys and the fat were burnt on the altar of burnt-offering, and part of the blood poured out at its foot; and part of it the priest carried into the sanctuary, with some of which he tinged the horns of the golden altar of sweet incense, and with the rest he sprinkled seven times before the Lord, before the veil of the sanctuary; Lev. iv. 4. 6—10. 17—19. 21. Of this sort was the high-priest's sin-offering bullock, when he had sinned through ignorance, "according to the sin of the people;" ver. 2, 3. The sacredness of his office was an aggravation of his sin beyond that of others, and his dignity rendered his example in doing evil more hurtful than theirs, for which reason a more solemn sacrifice was appointed to be offered for his sins, even of ignorance, than for those of the common people. Of this kind, also, was the high-priest's sin-offering bullock on the day of expiation, chap xvi. 6; only with this difference, that the blood of it was sprinkled, not before the veil

of the sanctuary, but before the mercy-seat, in the holy of holies; ver. 14.

Of this sort likewise was the sin-offering bullock for the sins through ignorance of the whole congregation, chap. iv. 13.

The Jewish writers are of different opinions concerning the occasion of these sacrifices. Some by the whole congregation understand the Sanhedrim, and imagine their sin to be, that they had mistaken in judgment, and by that means misled the people.* Others interpret it of any general popular defection from the law of God, which through their ignorance of the law was not presently attended to.† Thus when Hezekiah restored the true worship of God, after the temple had been shut up and the daily sacrifices omitted for a considerable time, he offered "a sin-offering for the kingdom, and for the sanctuary, and for Judah;" 2 Chron. xxix. 21. The sacrifice of Christ, which he offered for the sins of his people, is resembled in Scripture to the sin-offering of the congregation, because he offered it for all of them in the general, as when he is said to be "made sin," that is, a sin-offering, "for us;" 2 Cor. v. 21. And his sacrifice is represented to be of the same kind with those whose blood was brought within the sanctuary for sin, and whose bodies were burnt without the camp: "The bodies of those beasts," saith the apostle to the Hebrews, "whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high-priest for sin, are burnt without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate;" Heb. xiii. 11, 12, compared with Lev. xvi. 27. The burning of those sacrifices without the camp is to be understood therefore as typical, not only of Christ's suffering without the gates of Jerusalem, as the apostle applies it; but, probably, likewise of his suffering for the salvation of Gentiles, who were without the camp of Israel, as well as Jews; and the bringing the blood of those sacrifices into the holy place was a figure of Christ's presenting the merits of his death for us, in his heavenly intercession.

* Maimonides, and the rabbies in general. Vid. Outram de Sacrificiis, lib. i. cap. xiv. sect. i. p. 149, 150, and Hottinger de Juris Hebræor. Leg. cxviii. p. 147, 148, edit. Tigur. 1655.

† Aben-Ezra. Vid. Outram, sect. i. ad finem, et sect. ii. p. 150—152.

The third kind of sacrifices were called אשמים *asha-mim*, which we render trespass-offerings.* They so greatly resembled the sin-offerings, that it is not easy to distinguish between them. The occasions on which they were offered were much the same; nay, sometimes the same oblations are indifferently called sin-offerings or trespass-offerings, particularly in the following passage: "And he shall bring his trespass-offering, אשמו *ashamo*, unto the Lord, for his sin which he hath sinned, על חטאתו אשר חטא *gnal chattatho asher chata;* and if he be not able to bring a lamb, then he shall bring for his trespass which he hath committed, אשמו אשר חטא *ashamo asher chata*, two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, the one for a sin-offering, לחטאת *lechattath*, and the other for a burnt-offering;" Lev. v. 6—8. Where it is remarkable, that the offence committed is called indifferently a sin and a trespass; and the sacrifice offered, a trespass-offering and a sin-offering. Nevertheless, there are some circumstances in which these two kinds of sacrifices are observed to differ. Sin-offerings were sometimes offered for the whole congregation; trespass-offerings never, but for particular persons. Bullocks were sometimes used for sin-offerings, never for trespass-offerings. The blood of the sin-offerings was put on the horns of the altar, that of the trespass-offerings was only sprinkled round about the bottom of the altar: whence some have concluded, the difference between the sin-offerings and the trespass-offerings lay only in these circumstances. But others conceive there must have been some greater difference between them, which was the reason of their being offered with these different circumstances. Yet what that difference was, is variously conjectured by many learned men, rather than asserted by any. Dr. Lightfoot, from the rabbies,† makes the difference to lie in this, that both indeed were offered for the same sort of transgressions, but the אשם *asham*, or trespass-offering, was to be offered, when it was doubtful whether a person had transgressed or not. As, suppose he had eat some fat, and was afterward in doubt, whether it was the fat that belonged to the muscular flesh, which was lawful to be

* See the laws concerning them, Lev. v. and vi. and xiv. 12, 13, and xix. 20—22, and Numb. vi. 12.

† See, in particular, R. Abarbanel, Exord. Comment. in Levit. p. 307.

eaten; or the fat of the inwards, which was unlawful; then he was to offer an אשם *asham*. But if it were certain, and he knew that he had trespassed, he must offer the חטאה *chattaah*, or sin-offering.* Maimonides is of opinion, that the offences for which the אשם *asham* was offered, were inferior to those for which the חטאה *chattaah* was offered.† Bochart, on the contrary, is of opinion, that the offences expiated by אשם *asham*, were more grievous than those expiated by חטאה *chattaah*.‡ Aben-Ezra makes חטאה *chattaah* to signify a sacrifice offered for purging offences committed through ignorance of the law; אשם *asham* for such as were committed through forgetfulness of it.§ Others, again, make the difference to be, that the חטאה *chattaah* was for offences proved by witnesses; the אשם *asham* for secret faults, known to others only by the offender's confession. For it is said, "If his sin which he hath sinned, אלו הודע *hodhang elaiv*, come to his knowledge, then he shall bring his offering;" Lev. iv. 28. Now הודע *hodhang* is of a passive signification, and here therefore imports, if his fault be made known to him, by some other person, then he must offer a sin-offering; ver. 29. But elsewhere it is said, "When a person has been guilty of any of the things before mentioned, he shall confess that he hath sinned in that thing, and he shall bring his trespass-offering;" Lev. v. 5, 6. And, to mention only one opinion more, others think the חטאה *chattaah* had respect chiefly to offences against God; and אשם *asham*, chiefly to offences against men. To this purpose Dr. Outram observes, that in all cases where the אשם *asham* is required, there was some wrong or injury done him, except in the case of the Nazarite defiled by the dead, Numb. vi. 12, and of the leper, Lev. xiv. 12. But as both these were to be purged with a *chattaah* as well as an *asham*, he apprehends they afford no material objection to this general rule.‖

The fourth sort of sacrifices were שלמים *shelamim*, or

* Lightfoot's Temple Service, chap. viii.

† More Nevochim, part iii. cap. xlvi. p. 486, edit. et vers. Buxtorf. Basil. 1629.

‡ Hieroz. part. i. lib. ii. cap. xxxiii.

§ Aben-Ezra ad Lev. quoted by Outram, de Sacrificiis, p. 144.

‖ Outram de Sacrificiis, lib. i. cap. xiii. per totum, p. 135—147, especially sect. viii. p. 143—145.

peace-offerings; so called, not as being intended to make peace with God, but rather to preserve it. Burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings, were all offered under the notion of some offence committed, and some guilt contracted, which they were the means of removing; but in the peace-offerings the offerer was supposed to be at peace with God, and the offering was made rather in a way of thankful acknowledgment for mercies received, or as accompanying vows for the obtaining of farther blessings; or, in a way of free devotion, as a means of preserving and continuing peace with God. Thus the peace-offerings are distinguished into sacrifices of thanksgiving, votive-offerings, and voluntary or free-will offerings; Lev. vii. 11, 12. 16. The sacrifice of thanksgiving, which the Septuagint renders θυσια της αινεσεως, is evidently referred to in these words of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "By him let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God;" Heb. xiii. 15. Some peace-offerings were required, by the law, to be offered at certain times, and on particular occasions; as on the feast of Pentecost, Lev. xxiii. 19; by a Nazarite, when he had accomplished his vow, Numb. vi. 14; and at the consecration of the priest; Exod. xxix. 28. But generally it was referred to the devotion and free-will of the people, to offer these sacrifices when and how often they pleased.

The peace-offerings might be either of the flock or the herd, Lev. iii. 1. 6; that is, either of beeves, or sheep, or goats, and either male or female.

But birds were not allowed, the reason of which was, probably, because they were too small to admit of being divided into three parts: one for the altar, another for the priests, and a third for the offerer, without bringing the sacrifice into contempt.

In all peace-offerings, the fat, that is, the suet, as also the kidneys, were burnt upon the altar, Lev. iii. 3—5; and if the sacrifice was of the flock, that is, a sheep or a goat, the rump or tail was burnt along with them, ver. 9—11.

The breast and the right shoulder were the priest's due, and they are called the wave-breast and the heave-shoulder, Lev. vii. 34, because of the ceremony of waving them this way and that, and upward and downward, which was done by

the owner of the sacrifice, as the form of his presenting them to God. These portions of the peace-offerings were allotted toward the maintenance of the priests, during the weeks of their attendance at the sanctuary; for they were not permitted to carry them home with them unto their own houses in the country; but they and their families were to "eat them in the place which the Lord should choose;" that is, the place of his public most solemn worship by sacrifice; Deut. xii. 18.

Along with these peace-offerings, at least with those of thanksgiving, there was also offered bread of fine flour, and oil, both leavened and unleavened, made into cakes and wafers, which were likewise the priest's due; Lev. vii. 12, 13. The rest of the flesh of the peace-offerings belonged to the owner of the sacrifice, with which it was usual to make a feast, and entertain his friends, either on the day of the sacrifice, or the next day at farthest; for if any of the flesh remained till the third day, it was to be burnt; ver 17. Thus the lewd woman in the Proverbs is represented as inviting an unwary youth to a feast upon her votive peace-offerings; Prov. vii. 14. These feasts were often kept in the courts of the temple, or in some of the buildings adjoining, where there were cook-rooms, and conveniences for dressing the flesh of the sacrifices, as appears very probable from the account of the solemn Passover which Josiah kept at the temple, that the Levites "roasted the Passover with fire, according to the ordinance: but the other holy offerings sod they in pots, and in caldrons, and in pans, and divided them speedily among all the people. And afterward they made ready for themselves and for the priests;" 2 Chron. xxxv. 13, 14. In like manner they did at Shiloh, before the temple was built; where the sons of Eli, instead of contenting themselves with the breast and shoulder, which the law assigned them for their due, brought up a custom of sticking a three-pronged fork or hook into the caldron where the peace-offering was boiling, and taking whatever it brought up; 1 Sam. ii. 13, 14.

The Gentiles, likewise, who borrowed many of their sacrificial rites from the Jews, used sometimes to hold the feasts of their peace-offerings in the temples of their gods. Hence St. Paul, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, speaks of their

" sitting at meat in the idol's temple;" 1 Cor. viii. 10. But they did not always feast upon this flesh with their friends; they sometimes sold it in the common market, as is plainly intimated in the following passage of the same epistle, " Whatever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no question for conscience' sake," 1 Cor. x. 25, that is, as the context leads us to understand it, not inquiring whether it had been offered in sacrifice to an idol.

Thus much for the different sorts of sacrifices, in respect to their signification and use.

2dly. Sacrifices may be divided, in respect to the persons that offered them, into public and private.

1st. The public sacrifices were offered for the whole people of Israel; as two lambs for burnt-offerings every day, one in the morning, the other in the evening; which are called the continual burnt-offering, Exod. xxix. 42; two lambs more, that is, four, on every sabbath-day, Numb. xxviii. 9, 10; two young bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs, for a burnt-offering, and a kid of the goats for a sin-offering, every new moon, ver. 11. 15; and the same sacrifices every day of the feast of unleavened bread, and of the first-fruits, ver. 17, *et seq.* On the day of the feast of trumpets, on the great day of expiation, and at the feast of tabernacles, there were also extraordinary public sacrifices appointed; Numb. xxix. Beside these and some other stated public sacrifices, there were occasional public sacrifices sometimes offered; as the sin-offering of the congregation, when they had sinned through ignorance; Lev. iv. 13, 14. And on occasion of the war with the Benjamites, " all the children of Israel offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings before the Lord;" Judges xx. 26.

2dly. Private sacrifices, offered for particular persons, were either stated or occasional. Of the former sort was the paschal lamb, sacrificed annually for each family; and the high-priest's sin-offering for himself, on the day of expiation; Lev. xvi. 6. To this there is a reference in the following passage of the apostle: " Into the second" tabernacle, or holy of holies, " went the high-priest alone every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people;" Heb. ix. 7.

Occasional private sacrifices were offered on account of any

trespass committed against the law, or any legal pollution contracted, any vow made, any blessing received, &c.

3dly. Sacrifices are again to be distinguished, in respect to the subject-matter of them, into bloody or unbloody, or into animal and vegetable.

The animal sacrifices were of one species of the herd; namely, the bullock, or cow, including the calf: two of the flock; namely, sheep and goats: and two of the fowls; namely, doves and pigeons.

The unbloody, or vegetable sacrifices, of which we are to speak at present, were the מנחות *minchoth*, and נסכים *nesachim*, meat-offerings and drink-offerings. As for the tithes and first-fruits, we shall have occasion to speak of them hereafter.

The meat-offerings were either attended with drink-offerings, or they were offered alone.

1st. The meat-offerings, attended with drink-offerings, called מנחות נסכים *minchoth nesachim*, were fine flour, salt, and oil, made either into thick cakes, or thin wafers, and baked either in a pan or oven. The drink-offering was of wine, which was poured out at the base of the altar. These meat and drink-offerings were a sort of appendages to the sacrifices; they were offered along with all the burnt-offerings, except of birds, and with the peace-offerings, Numb. xv. 3, &c.; but not with the sin-offerings, except that which was offered at the cleansing a leper; Lev. xiv. 10.

2dly. The meat-offerings alone, which were not offered along with animal sacrifices, were either public or private.

The public were the wave sheaf, Lev. xxiii. 10, 11, and the twelve cakes of shew bread; Lev. xxiv. 5.

The private were either enjoined by the law, as that of the priest at his consecration, Lev. vi. 20, and that which the jealous husband was to offer, Numb. v. 15; or they were allowed in case of poverty, when the persons could not afford a more costly sacrifice; Lev. v. 11.

The meat-offerings were all of white flour, except that of the jealous husband, which was of barley meal, without any mixture; and the wave sheaf, which was not ground into flour; all the rest were fine wheat flour, seasoned with salt; Lev. ii. 13. Some were mixt with oil, or frankincense, or both; ver. 15. Some were offered unbaked, others baked.

Some were eat by the priests, without bringing them to the altar at all; as the leavened cakes and the shew bread.

Some were wholly consumed on the altar, as every meat-offering for a priest; Lev. vi. 23.

But as to the most of them, a memorial or small part was consumed on the altar; the rest belonged to the priest; Lev. ii. 2, 3.

Thus I have given you a brief account of the Jewish sacrifices. I shall only farther observe, that if a person, obliged by the law to offer any of these sacrifices, refused to do it, he was punished even with "cutting off." But the Jews were generally so zealously attached to their law, that there was very rarely an occasion for inflicting punishment upon this account. If a man, who lived at a great distance from Jerusalem, had fallen under an offence, which required him to make a sin or a trespass-offering, the rabbies say, he might defer it till the next solemn festival, when all were obliged to appear before the Lord at the national altar.*

* See on this subject Maimonides de Sacrificiis, Abarbanel's Exordium Comment. in Levit., and Outram de Sacrificiis.

CHAPTER VI.

OF THE PROPHETS.

CONCERNING the prophets, we shall first consider the name, and then the duty and business of the prophetic office.

As to the name, there are three different words, by which prophets are denominated in Scripture; namely, ראה חזה נביא *roeh, chozeh, nabhi,* which are all found in one passage, where we read of Samuel הראה *haroeh,* Nathan הנביא *hannabhi,* and Gad החזה *hachozeh;* 1 Chron. xxix. 29. The word נביא *nabhi,* is by some derived from בוא *bo, venit,* intimating that God came to the prophet by the divine afflatus. Thus Ezekiel saith, ותבא בי רוח *vattabo bi ruach,* which we render, "and the spirit entered into me," Ezek. ii. 2. Some light, perhaps, may be hereby given to that remarkable promise of Christ, "If any man love me, he will keep my words, and I and my Father will love him, and we will come and make our abode with him," John xiv. 23; namely, by the continual influence of the Spirit on his heart.

But others derive נביא *nabhi* from נוב *nubh, provenire,* from whence comes ניב *nibh, germen, fructus,* a word metaphorically applied to speech, which is called the fruit, ניב *nibh,* of the lips, Isa. lvii. 19; and it is said the mouth of the just bringeth forth ינוב *janubh,* wisdom; Prov. x. 31. Prophecy, therefore, being the fruit of the lips in consequence of divine inspiration, the prophet is called נביא *nabhi.* In the first place wherein this word occurs, it is applied to Abraham: "Restore the man his wife, for he is a prophet, and he shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live; but if thou restore her not, thou shalt die;" Gen. xx. 7. Where a נביא *nabhi* is supposed to be a friend of God, whom he would not suffer to be wronged, and whose prayers were very prevalent with him. Accordingly by the Psalmist God is represented as saying, "Touch not mine

anointed, and do my prophets no harm;" Psalm cv. 15. And from the following passage of Jeremiah, it appears to have been the special business of the נבאים *nebhiim*, or prophets, to pray for the people: "If they be prophets, and if the word of the Lord be with them, let them now make intercession to the Lord of hosts," &c.; chap. xxvii. 18. And their prayers are supposed to be very prevalent with God: "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people;" chap. xv. 1. When, therefore, God was determined to bring judgments upon the Israelites, he forbad Jeremiah the prophet to pray for them: "Then said the Lord unto me, Pray not for this people for their good;" chap. xiv. 11.

The other two names of a prophet, חזה *chozeh* and ראה *roeh*, seem to be synonymous, both signifying, one that seeth or discerneth; the former from חזה *chazah*, and the latter from ראה *raah, vidit*. And, indeed, it is hard to say, how these three names or titles differ in their signification.

It should seem, the word ראה *roeh* was the more ancient denomination of the prophet: but in the days of Samuel the word נביא *nabhi* was grown into more common use; as appears from the following passage: "He that is now called a prophet, נביא *nabhi*, was beforetime called a seer, ראה *roeh*;" 1 Sam. ix. 9. Here a considerable difficulty ariseth; for we do not any where meet with the word ראה *roeh* in the Scripture history before this time, whereas the word נביא *nabhi* is common in the writings of Moses; who is therefore by some supposed not to have been the author of the Pentateuch, a word commonly occurring therein, which it seems was not used till long after his days.

One solution that has been offered is, that the word נביא *nabhi*, though in common use in the days of Moses, was not used in the same sense as ראה *roeh* was in the days of Samuel, namely, for a revealer of secrets, or a man by whom God was to be consulted; but that anciently it only signified a friend of God, one who had an intimacy with him. But this is hardly reconcileable with the character of a נביא *nabhi*, or prophet, described in several places of the Pentateuch (Numb. xii. 6; Deut. xiii. 1; and chap. xviii. 22), as one to whom God makes himself known by visions, or dreams, who gives

miraculous signs of his divine mission, and foretells things to come. And surely such a one must be as capable of revealing secrets as any ראה *roeh*, or seer, in after-times.

Others solve the difficulty, by supposing the word ראה *roeh* was anciently in vulgar use, and being esteemed a low word, which would have been unsuitable to the purity and dignity of Moses's style, he for that reason always uses the politer word נביא *nabhi;* but that in Samuel's time נביא *nabhi* was also grown into common and vulgar use. No doubt there might be words in the Hebrew, as there are in our language, which are decently enough used in conversation, but are hardly thought proper for the pulpit, or for any grave compositions. Of this sort might have been the word ראה *roeh;* but as the language grew more refined, it was of course dropped, and the more polite word *nabhi* substituted in its room, both in conversation and in writing. It is observed in confirmation of this opinion, that the word ראה *roeh* is but very seldom used in the sacred writings.

After all, I know not whether two lines of Horace, in his Art of Poetry, will not suggest the easiest solution of this difficulty:

> Multa renascentur, quæ jam cecidere; cadentque
> Quæ nunc sunt in honore vocabula, si volet usus.
> L. 70, 71.

The word נביא *nabhi* might have been common in the days of Moses, it might have grown much out of use in some centuries afterwards, when ראה *roeh* was used instead of it; and nevertheless, be revived and become common in the days of Samuel.

Thus much for the name; we now come to consider the thing, or the duty and business of a prophet.

A prophet, in the strict and proper sense, was one to whom the knowledge of secret things was revealed, that he might declare them to others,* whether they were things past, or present, or to come. The woman of Samaria perceived our Saviour was a prophet, by his telling her the secrets of her past life; John iv. 19. The prophet Elisha had the present conduct of his servant Gehazi revealed to him; 2 Kings v. 26.

* Maimon. Præfat. in Mishn. p. 4, edit. Surenhus. Appellabant Prophetam, Videntem, quod res futuras, antequam existerent, prævideret

And most of the prophets had revelations concerning future events; above all, concerning the coming and kingdom of the Messiah: "He has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David, as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began;" Luke i. 69, 70.* Nevertheless, in a more lax or analogical sense, the title prophet is sometimes given to persons who had no such revelation, nor were properly inspired. Thus Aaron is said to be Moses's prophet: "The Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet," Exod. vii. 1: because Aaron received the divine messages, which he carried to Pharaoh immediately from Moses; whereas other prophets receive their messages immediately from God himself. In this respect, as Moses stood in the place of God to Pharaoh, so Aaron acted in the character of his prophet.

The title of prophets is given also to the sacred musicians, who sung the praises of God, or who accompanied the song with musical instruments. Thus "the sons of Asaph, and of Heman, and of Jeduthun," are said to "prophesy with harps, with psalteries, and with cymbals," 1 Chron. xxv. 1; and they prophesied, it is said, "according to the order of the king;" ver. 2. Upon which R. S. Jarchi remarks, they prophesied when they played upon these musical instruments. We also read in the story of Saul's advancement to the kingdom of Israel, that he met "a company of prophets coming down from the high place with a psaltery and a tabor, and a pipe, and a harp before them; and they prophesied, and he with them;" 1 Sam. x. 5. 10. What kind of prophecy this was is evident; it was praising God with spiritual songs, and the melody of musical instruments. Perhaps Miriam, the sister of Aaron, may be called a prophetess only on this account, that she led the concert of the women, who sung the song of Moses with timbrels and with dances; Exod. xv. 20, 21. Thus the heathen poets, who sung or composed verses in praise of their gods, were called by the Romans *vates*, or prophets; which is of the same import with the Greek προφητης,

* The rabbies say, all the prophets prophesied concerning the Messiah. Vid. Cod. Sanhedrin, cap. xi. sect. xxxvii. p. 362; Cocceii excerpt. Gemar.

a title which St. Paul gives to Epimenides, a Cretan poet; Tit. i. 12.

This notion of prophets and prophesying may give some light to the following passage in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. xi. 5: "Every woman, praying or prophesying with her head uncovered, dishonoureth her head." Prophesying cannot be understood in the stricter sense of foretelling things to come, nor even of interpreting the holy Scriptures by divine inspiration; in which sense the word seems to be used, when the apostle, discoursing of spiritual gifts, prefers the gift of prophecy above all others, because, saith he, "he that prophesieth speaketh unto men for edification, and exhortation, and comfort;" 1 Cor. xiv. 3. However, neither of these kinds of prophesying will suit with the design of the apostle, when, in the passage we are now considering, he speaks of a woman's prophesying in the church or congregation; for there she was not permitted to speak, nor so much as to ask a question for her instruction, much less to teach and instruct others; ver. 34. In order to solve the difficulty, some would have the word προφητευουσα to be taken passively, and to signify, a hearing or being present at prophesying: but this is an acceptation of the term contrary to the rules of grammar, and without example either in Scripture or in any profane author. Besides, though she may properly enough be said to pray, as joining with the minister, who is the mouth of the congregation to God; yet with no propriety can she be said to prophesy, only as attending on the preaching of the minister, who is considered as the mouth of God to the congregation.

Perhaps, then, prophesying may here mean (as we have shown it does mean in other places) praising God in psalms and hymns. And thus praying and prophesying are fitly joined together, these being the two parts of public worship, in which the whole congregation is supposed to unite.*

* Vid. Mede's Diatrib. disc. xvi. on 1 Cor. xi. 5, p. 58, et seq. of his Works. Smith, in his Discourse on Prophecy, apprehends that singing was called prophecy, when the songs or psalms were composed under the influence of the Divine Spirit, to the sound of musical instruments. Perhaps some of the prophets having uttered such inspired compositions to music,

We have observed, that a prophet, in the strict and proper sense, was one, to whom the knowledge of secret things was revealed, in order that he might declare them to others. Of such prophets the talmudists reckon forty-eight from Abraham to Malachi, and seven prophetesses.* It is remarkable, that though, to make up their catalogue, they take in Eldad and Medad, mentioned in the book of Numbers, chap. xi. 26; concerning whom, however, it does not appear that they revealed any secret; but their prophesying was no more than exhorting the people to obedience to God, to which they were moved, and in which they were assisted by the Holy Spirit, as were the rest of the seventy elders, ver. 25; notwithstanding this, I say, they do not admit Daniel into the list,† nor place his writings among those of the prophets, but only among the hagiographa;‡ which they reckon of the least authority of all the canonical books. The reasons they assign for it, as they are recited by the authors of the Ancient Universal History,§ are,

1st. That Daniel was a courtier, and spent his life in luxury and grandeur, in the service of an uncircumcised king.

2dly. That the spirit of prophecy was confined to the land of Canaan, out of which he lived all his life. And some have added a

3d reason; namely, that he was made a eunuch, according to Isaiah's prophecy, which he delivered to Hezekiah, 2 Kings xx. 18; and such were excluded from entering into the congregation of the Lord: though Aben-Ezra vindicates him from this imputation.‖

might give occasion to the more general application of the term to all who sung divine hymns, accompanied with instrumental music. See Smith's Select Discourses, p. 230. 232.

* Vid. Megill. fol. xiv. i. et R. S. Jarchi ad loc.; vid. etiam notam Vorstii ad p. 124; Maimon. tract. de Fundament. Legis. edit. Amstel. 1680.

† Vid. Cocceii excerpt. Gemar. Cod. Sanhedr. cap. xi. sect. xvi. p. 324, edit. Amstel. 1629. Hi (nempe Haggæus, Zacharias, et Malachias) præstabant ipsi, qui essent prophetæ, quum Daniel non fuerit propheta. Ipse illis major ob visam visionem.

‡ Maimon. More Nevoch. part ii. cap. xlv. p. 318, 319, edit. Buxtorf. Basil. 1629.

§ Hist. of the Jews, book i. chap. vii. sect. iii. sub fin. note.

‖ Aben-Ezra in Daniel.

R. Johanan is represented in the Gemara as casting a still more injurious reflection on him; namely, that he stole into Egypt to buy hogs, at the time Nebuchadnezzar set up his golden image, and his three friends, Shadrach, Meshech, and Abednego, were thrown into the fiery furnace for refusing to worship it.*

After all, it is easy to discern what was the true cause of the rancour which many of the rabbies have discovered against this eminent prophet: it is because he has so clearly predicted and ascertained the time of the Messiah's coming, which is long since elapsed; and because of the great advantage which the Christians have hereby obtained in their arguments against the Jews. Therefore, I say, though their historian Josephus was so far from denying him the title of a prophet, that he has in several respects given him the preference to the rest of the prophets;† and notwithstanding the high character that is given of him in the prophecy of Ezekiel, chap. xiv. 14, wherein he is ranked with Noah and Job, men of eminent righteousness and piety; nevertheless, several of the rabbies, though not all,‡ have spitefully endeavoured to sink his character below that of a prophet, or even of a good man.

Malachi has been commonly reckoned by the Christians the last prophet§ under the Old Testament dispensation, with whom the spirit of prophecy ceased four hundred eighty-six years before Christ. Nevertheless Josephus mentions several others, who during those ages predicted various future events by the spirit of prophecy; as one Judas an Essene,‖ Sameas,¶ Mahanem;** and Hircanus the high-priest, the fourth of the Asmonean princes from Judas Maccabeus, is said by Josephus

* Vid. Cod. Sanhedrin, cap. xi. sect. xiii. apud Cocceii excerpt. Gemar. p. 320, edit. Amstel. 1629.

† Antiq. lib. x. cap. xi. sect. vii. p. 543, edit. Haverc.

‡ Vid. Hottinger. Thesaur. Philolog. lib. ii. cap. i. sect. iii. p. 511, edit. Tigur. 1649.

§ So saith the Talmud likewise. Vid. Cocceii excerpt. Gemar. Sanhedr. cap. i. sect. xiii. p. 156. Tradunt Magistri, ex quo mortui sunt prophetæ posteriores, Haggæus, Zacharias, Malachias, ablatus est Spiritus Sanctus ab Israele.

‖ Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. xi. sect. ii. p. 665, edit. Haverc. *Ιουδαν τινα Εσσηνον μεν το γενος, ουδεποτε δε εν οις προειπε διαψευσαμενον ταληθες.*

¶ Lib. xv. cap. i. sect. i. p. 740. ** Ibid. cap. x. sect. v. p. 777.

to be honoured with three of the highest dignities, being a prophet, as well as prince and high-priest. In his Antiquities he gives two instances of his prophetic gift.* However that be, we have good authority to add John the Baptist to the list of prophets under the Old Testament, though his history is recorded in the New; for he lived and prophesied before the kingdom of God, or the Messiah's kingdom, was set up. Accordingly our Saviour distinguishes the time in which John the Baptist lived, from the time of the kingdom of God, or the gospel dispensation. "Among those that are born of women, there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist, but he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he," Luke vii. 28; that is, on account of the clearness of the gospel revelation, by means of which, ordinary Christians may know more of the glories of divine grace, than any of the Old Testament prophets, or even John himself knew.

On the same account we may add to the list of the Old Testament prophets, Zachariah, the father of John, "who was filled with the Holy Ghost and prophesied," Luke i. 67; and likewise Simeon, and Anna the prophetess; chap. ii. 25. 36. Indeed, some of the Jewish rabbies will not allow that the spirit of prophecy ever quite departed from them; but they tell us of a certain δαδουχια, or torch of prophecy, one shining when another was set. R. Kimchi gives us this mystical gloss upon the following passage in the First Book of Samuel: "And it came to pass at that time, when Eli was laid down in his place, and his eyes began to wax dim, that he could not see, and ere the lamp of God went out in the temple of the Lord, where the ark of God was, and Samuel was laid down to sleep, that the Lord called Samuel," chap. iii. 2—4;—I say, R. Kimchi, glossing on these words, saith, "This is spoken mystically concerning the spirit of prophecy; according to the saying among our doctors, The sun riseth, and the sun setteth; that is, ere God makes the sun of one righteous man to set, he makes the sun of another righteous man to rise."

But, leaving the Jewish whims and fables concerning the number of their prophets, we proceed to inquire concerning

* Lib. xiii. cap. x. sect. iii. p. 662; and cap. xii. sect. i. p. 666.

the manner in which the revelation was made, both by God to the prophets, and by them to the people.

However, before we directly consider the manner in which God revealed secrets to the prophets, it will be proper to premise a few words concerning the qualifications of a prophet, or the pre-requisites to a man's receiving the spirit of prophecy.

The first and most essential qualification of a prophet was true piety. This is the constant sense and opinion of the Jewish doctors.* To which agree those words of St. Peter, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" 2 Pet. i. 21. Yet this general rule is not without exceptions; for God, on special occasions and for particular purposes, sometimes vouchsafed the prophetic spirit to bad men; as to Balaam, "who loved the wages of unrighteousness." However, it may well be supposed, that none but good men were stated prophets, so as to be frequently favoured with the divine afflatus; and especially, that none but such were honoured with being employed as the writers of any part of the canon of Scripture; insomuch, that the assertion of St. Peter concerning the written prophecies of the Old Testament, is true without exception.

We may, perhaps, reasonably account for the ceasing of the spirit of prophecy from among the Jews in the latter ages of their polity, till it was revived at the coming of our Saviour, from their universal degeneracy and corruption in religion and morals.

2dly. The mind of the prophet must be in a proper posture and frame for receiving the divine afflatus, or prophetic spirit; that is, say the doctors, it must not be oppressed with grief, or disturbed with passion of any kind. Their tradition says, that Jacob did not prophecy all the time of his grief for the loss of Joseph; nor Moses for a long time after the return of the spies, who brought an evil report of the land of Canaan, because of his indignation against them.† And by the holy spirit, which David prays might not be taken away, but restored to him, Psalm li. 10, 11, the Chaldee Paraphrast, and the Hebrew commentators, understand the spirit of prophecy,

* Maimon. Moreh Nevoch. part ii. cap. xxxii. p. 284.

† Maimon. Moreh Nevoch. cap. xxxvi. p. 295, 296.

which, they say, was withdrawn on account of his sorrow and grief for his shameful miscarriage in the matter of Uriah. And when he prays, that God would "make him to hear joy and gladness," ver. 8, they understand it of a cheerful frame of mind, which would fit him for receiving the prophetic afflatus; and "the free spirit, with which he prays he might be upheld," ver. 12, they interpret of a spirit of alacrity and liberty of mind, free from the oppression of grief, or discomposure of passion.

In order to prove, that passion disqualified a man for receiving the prophetic afflatus, they allege the story of Elisha, in the third chapter of the Second Book of Kings: when the kings of Judah, and Israel, and Edom, in their distress for water during an expedition against Moab, came to Elisha, to inquire of God by him, the prophet seems to have been moved with indignation against the wicked king of Israel, addressing him in the following manner: "What have I to do with thee? Get thee to the prophets of thy father, and to the prophets of thy mother; surely if it were not that I regard the presence of Jehosaphat, the king of Judah, I would not look upon thee, nor see thee;" 2 Kings iii. 12, 13. However, being willing to oblige Jehosaphat, "he called for a minstrel; and it came to pass when the minstrel played, that the hand of the Lord came upon him;" ver. 15. The use of the minstrel seems to be to calm his passion and compose his mind, that he might be fit to receive the divine afflatus.

This may perhaps suggest to us one reason, why the prophets practised music, see 1 Sam. x. 5; namely, because of its tendency to compose their minds, and to free them from all such melancholy or angry passions, as would render them unfit for the spirit of prophecy. We find this remedy successfully applied to Saul's melancholy: "And it came to pass, when the evil spirit from God was upon Saul, that David took an harp and played with his hand; so Saul was refreshed and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him;" 1 Sam. xvi. 23. This evil spirit was perhaps originally nothing but melancholy, or grief and anguish, which, however, through divine permission, was wrought upon and heightened by the insinuations of some evil spirit, which, at times, it seems, instigated him to prophesy: "It came to pass on the morrow,

that the evil spirit came upon him, and he prophesied in the midst of the house," 1 Sam. xviii. 10; which the Targum of Jonathan renders "insanivit in medio domús;" and Rabbi Levi Ben Gershon glosses upon it thus: "He spake in the midst of the house very confusedly, by reason of the evil spirit." But why this should be called prophesying is not easy to determine, unless he sometimes sung in his raving fits, since singing is called prophesying, as we have already shown. Mr. Henry supposes, Saul pretended a religious ecstasy, imitating the motions and gestures of a prophet, with a design to decoy David into a snare, and put him off from his guard, and perhaps, if he could kill him, to impute it to a divine impulse. However that was, Saul's original disorder was probably melancholy, for which music was a proper remedy. And so it is often still found to be; particularly for the deep melancholy occasioned by the bite of a tarantula, which is ordinarily cured by this means. You may see a great variety of instances of the powerful effects of music in calming the passions of the mind, and in some cases curing the disorders of the body, produced by Bochart in his Hierozoicon.*

We come now to consider the manner in which God revealed secrets to the prophets; which the apostle saith was πολυτροπως, "in divers manners," Heb. i. 1, as by dreams, visions, inspirations, voices, and angels.

1st. By dreams and visions. I join these together, since they seem to be sometimes used as synonymous terms; and visions import no more than prophetic dreams. Thus Nebuchadnezzar's dream is called the visions of his head; Dan. ii. 28. And so is Daniel's dream, chap. vii. 1. This is properly what we are to understand by a "vision of the night," in the book of Job, chap. xx. 8; and God is said to speak "in a dream, in a vision of the night;" chap. xxxiii. 14, 15. And in Genesis, God "spake unto Israel in the visions of the night;" chap. xlvi. 2. Nevertheless, in some other places, visions seem to be distinguished from dreams; as in the following passage: "Your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions;" Joel ii. 28. When a vision is distinguished from a dream, I conceive it denotes

* Part i. lib. ii. cap. xliv. p. 461—465, Oper. vol. ii. 1712.

the representation of things made to the imagination of the prophet while he is awake. Perhaps the difference between prophetic dreams and visions may be much the same as between common dreams and a delirium in a fever; in which the patient, though awake, imagines he sees things and persons that are not present, and of which therefore his senses give him no notice.

Such was the vision that St. Peter saw in a trance or ecstasy; Acts xi. 5. For he saw it, not upon his bed in the visions of the night, but on the house-top about noon, while he was at prayer; chap. x. 9, 10. Such perhaps was Paul's vision of the third heavens, 2 Cor. xii. 1, 2. 4; though whether this was not more than a vision, Paul himself could not inform us: "Whether in the body, I cannot tell; or out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth." That is, whether celestial objects were represented to him in a vision only; or whether his soul was really for a time separated from his body, and translated into the heavenly regions. However, by the way, we may surely conclude, from St. Paul's uncertainty on this head, that the soul is something quite distinct from the body, which can exist and act, and receive and understand celestial things in a state of separation from it; otherwise the soul must have had this vision in the body, or not at all, and it could have been no doubt with St. Paul, whether at this time he was in the body or out of the body.

Again, the word vision is applied, not only to such imaginary representations, but to real miraculous appearances made to the senses. Thus the angel's appearing to Zachariah in the temple is called a vision; Luke i. 22. Sometimes the word is used in a laxer sense, for any kind of divine revelation; as the voice which the child Samuel heard in the tabernacle, is called a vision, though it does not seem to have been accompanied with any sensible appearance; 1 Sam. iii. 15. The books of the prophecies of Isaiah, Obadiah, and Nahum, are expressly called their visions; though it does not seem probable, that all the revelations contained in them, were conveyed to the prophets by visionary representations.

It has been inquired, how the prophets could certainly distinguish these prophetic dreams and visions from common dreams, and from enthusiastical and diabolical delusions: for

which purposes several criteria have been assigned by Jewish and Christian writers; for instance,

1st. Divine dreams and visions are said to have been known by the extraordinary majesty and splendour of the appearance, or the strength and vigour of the representation made to the prophet, and the liveliness of his perception of it; see Dan. vii. 8; viii. 27; x. 8; which, sometimes, was such as the feeble powers of nature could hardly sustain.*

2dly. During the divine ecstasy, the prophet had the full exercise of his reason;† whereas diabolical possessions and inspirations threw him into a fit of madness. So Virgil describes the Sybil, when the prophetic afflatus came upon her, as perfectly distracted and raving.

> ————Subito non vultus, non color unus,
> Non comptæ mansere comæ: sed pectus anhelans,
> Et rabie fera corda tument; majorque videri,
> Nec mortale sonans: Afflata est Numine quando
> Jam propriore Dei.
>
> Æneid. vi. l. 47, et seq.

3dly. The subject-matter of divine visions and revelations, it is supposed, was always serious, weighty, and important; such as it became the wisdom, and holiness, and majesty of God to reveal.

After all, if we are content without being wise above what is written, we must frankly acknowledge, we do not certainly know what those criteria were. But of this we may be sure, and it is sufficient, that God, who has an absolute power over the hearts and spirits of men, can give any man certain evidence and assurance in his own breast, that a revelation, which he is pleased to vouchsafe, does indeed come from him; otherwise, God would be supposed to be the most im-

* Maimon. de Fundament. Legis, cap. vii. sect. iii. p. 92. 103, edit. et interpret. Verstii, Amstel. 1680.

† This is agreeable to the definition which Maimonides gives of prophecy, that it is an influence of the Deity, first upon the rational, and then upon the imaginative faculty, by the mediation of the active intellect. Vid. Moreh Nevoch. part ii. cap. xxxvi. p. 292; compare cap. xxxviii., especially p. 300. De veris prophetis tantum loquutus sum, ut nempe excipiam eos, —qui nulla rationalia, neque sapientiam habent, sed nudas tantùm imaginationes, et cogitationes. Reason, therefore, according to this judicious rabbi, was always in exercise during the prophetic ecstasy.

potent of all rational beings, who, while he is capable of conveying his mind to his creatures, is incapable of making them sensible that he does so. When Jacob awoke out of his sleep, he certainly knew (by what criterion we cannot tell) that the visionary dream, with which he had been favoured, was of God; Gen. xxviii. 16. Pharaoh, though a heathen king, knew his dream was extraordinary and prophetic, as appears by his spirit being so troubled about it, and by his sending for all the magicians and wise men of Egypt to explain it to him; Gen. xli. 8. And Nebuchadnezzar was sure he had had an extraordinary prophetic dream, though he could not recollect it. Otherwise we cannot suppose he would have been so exceeding angry at the wise men of Babylon, for not revealing and explaining it to him; Dan. ii. 12. And no doubt God gave Abraham likewise such irresistible evidence and assurance, that it was he who commanded him to sacrifice his son Isaac, as overcame all the reluctance of paternal affection, and whatever reason might object against so unnatural a sacrifice, or he would never have set about it.

Thus much for the criteria by which the prophets might know, that their dreams or visions, and other revelations, came from God.

Before we have done with this head, it will be proper to inquire, by what criteria other persons might judge and be assured, that the revelations which the prophets delivered, were true divine revelations.

Here it must be observed, that if the prophet delivered any thing that was contradictory to the invariable law of nature, it was to be rejected, and he was to be treated as a false prophet, even though he produced miracles in evidence of his mission from God; Deut xiii. 1—3. For it was a much more supposeable case, that the devil might counterfeit miracles, than that God would contradict the immutable law of nature.

But if nothing which the prophet delivered was contrary to that law, then his divine mission might be evidenced various ways:—

1st. By the sanctity of his own life,* which afforded very

* Maimon. de Fundament. Legis, cap. vii. sect. i. ii. p. 87—89, edit. et interpret. Vorstii, Amstel. 1680.

probable ground to believe, that he did not counterfeit and pretend revelations which had not been made to him. Upon this evidence, Herod regarded John the Baptist as a divine prophet. He "feared John, knowing that he was a just man and holy;" Mark vi. 20.

2dly. By the testimony of other prophets of undoubted veracity.* Thus Moses bore testimony to Joshua, when he gave him a charge in the name of God before all the congregation; Deut. xxxi. 23. And John the Baptist, whom the Jews acknowledged to be a prophet, bore witness to Christ; John i. 29, 30.

3dly. Sometimes his mission was proved by miracles; as the mission of Moses to the people of Israel, Exod. iv. 1—10, and afterward to Pharaoh, chap. vii. 9.

4thly. At other times by some sudden and remarkable judgment from God, upon such as slighted and rejected the message he delivered in the name of the Lord: as on Jeroboam, when he commanded the man of God to be taken into custody for the prediction he delivered, 1 Kings xiii. 1—6; and in the case of Elijah's calling down fire from heaven, to consume the captains and troops of the king of Samaria; 2 Kings i. 9—12.

5thly. By the accomplishment of his predictions; whereas, if what he foretold did not come to pass, he was to be treated as a false prophet; Deut. xviii. 22. Yet this rule was not to hold concerning the predictions of judgments, but only of good things or favourable events; see Jer. xxviii. 9. But as for prophetic threatenings, they were supposed to be conditional, and that the judgments or punishments denounced might be averted by repentance. It is evident, the Ninevites understood Jonah's prediction of the destruction of their city in forty days in this sense, though delivered without any condition expressed; Jonah iii. 4. Otherwise, they would have had no encouragement to repent, in hopes that thereby the judgment might be averted; ver. 9. It was, therefore, no evidence against Jonah's being a true prophet, commissioned of God, that this his prediction was not fulfilled.†

It is very proper, while we are upon the subject of pro-

* Maimon. de Fundament. Legis, cap. x. sect. ix. p. 147.

† Maimon. de Fundament. Legis, cap. x. sect. ii.—viii.

phetic dreams and visions, to inquire whether the accounts of the several symbolical actions, said to be done by the prophets, are histories of real facts, or only relations of their dreams and visions. Such as Isaiah's walking naked and barefoot three years, "for a sign and wonder" upon Egypt and Ethiopia, chap. xx. 2, 3; Jeremiah's hiding his girdle in a rock by Euphrates, chap. xiii. 4, 5; Ezekiel's mock siege of Jerusalem, chap. iv.; Hosea's taking a wife of whoredom, chap. i. 2; and several others.

Learned men, of considerable reputation, have been divided in their sentiments on this question. Abarbanel and R. Solomon among the Jews, and the generality of Christian writers before Calvin, understood these narratives in the literal sense, as histories of real facts. On the other side, Aben-Ezra and Maimonides,* and, since Calvin, several other Christian writers take them to be only relations of prophetic dreams and visions.

The principal argument alleged to prove these actions were really done, is, that several of them are said to be signs to the people: as Isaiah's walking naked and barefoot, Ezekiel's mock siege of Jerusalem, chap. iv. 3, and his removing his household goods; chap. xii. 6. Now, it is said, how could that be a sign to any people, which never was presented before them, but only acted in the imagination of the prophet? To this, however, it may be replied, that these expressions, "this shall be a sign," or "I have set thee to be a sign to the house of Israel," were a part of the dream or vision; the prophet imagining not only that he saw and did certain things or actions, but that he heard such declarations concerning the end for which they were designed. These were, therefore, imaginary signs, given to imaginary persons; but when afterward the vision was revealed to the real persons, for whose use it was intended, it must have the same effect upon them (provided they believed it to be a divine vision) as if it had been a real fact, and transacted before their eyes. And thus what was done in vision was properly a sign to them to whom it was declared and applied by the prophet.

On the other hand, to prove that these symbolical actions of the prophets were done only in imagination, or that the ac-

* Vid. Maimon. Moreh Nevoch. part. ii. cap. xlvi.

counts of them are mere narratives of the prophets' dreams or visions, it is alleged,

1st. That several of the things said to be done, are highly improbable, if not impossible to be really performed. For instance, that Isaiah should walk naked and barefooted three years together, summer and winter, even if you understand by his being naked, merely being without his upper garment: that Jeremiah should send yokes to the king of Edom, and to the king of Moab, and to the king of the Ammonites, and to the king of Tyrus, and to the king of Zidon, Jer. xxvii. 3; and that he should take so long a journey as from Jerusalem to the Euphrates, which is about five hundred miles, to hide his girdle in a rock; and that after it was rotted, he should take the same long journey to fetch it back again, chap. xiii. 4. 6, 7; and that he should take a wine-cup from God, and carry it up and down to all nations, far and near, even all the kingdoms which are upon the face of the earth, and make them drink it,—is more than improbable; chap. xxv. 15—29. So likewise that Ezekiel should actually eat a roll, which God gave him, chap. iii. 1. 3; and that he should lie upon his left side three hundred and ninety days together, and after that forty days together on his right side, with bands upon him that he could not turn from one side to the other, chap. iv., is not only extremely improbable upon several accounts, but hardly possible to be done in the time allotted to this whole affair; for it all passed between the prophet's seeing his first vision at the river Kebar, which was on the fifth day of the fourth month, in the fifth year of king Jehoiachin's captivity, chap. i. 1, 2, and his sitting in his house with the elders of Judah on the fifth day of the sixth month of the sixth year, chap. viii. 1; that is, within a year and two months. Now the Jewish year, being lunar, consisted of three hundred fifty-four days, and their month of twenty-nine days and thirty days alternately; therefore a year and two months (three hundred fifty-four, twenty-nine, and thirty, added together) could amount to no more than four hundred and thirteen days; which falls short of the number of days, during which the prophet is said to lie on his side, namely, four hundred and thirty days, by seventeen days. And if you deduct also, from the four hundred and thirteen days, the seven

days which he sat among the captives at Telabib, chap. iii. 15, there remains but four hundred and six days; which are twenty-four days short of four hundred and thirty.

The only colour of an answer which I have met with to this argument, is, that possibly this might be an embolymean year, in which a whole month was intercalated; as it was once in three years; or, more exactly, there were seven embolymean years in nineteen, in order to reduce the lunar year to the solar. On this supposition, indeed, there will be time enough for the prophet's lying on his side, in the literal sense, four hundred and thirty days. But this solution is too subtle for common readers. Four hundred and thirty days, with the addition of seven days when the prophet sat at Telabib, amount to a year and nearly three months in common computation; and can it be thought the sacred writer would have allotted but a year and two months for the whole affair (supposing it to be a history of real fact), without the least hint how the glaring contradiction, which would stare every body in the face on the first reading, might possibly be reconciled?

To this head of impossibilities we may refer God's bringing Abraham abroad into the field, and showing him the stars, Gen. xv. 5; since it appears, that it was not yet sun-set: "when the sun was going down," it is said, "a great sleep fell upon Abraham;" ver. 12. From whence it is manifest, that his going out before to view the stars, his ordering several living creatures for sacrifice, and his driving away the fowls that came down upon the carcasses, were all performed in prophetic vision only; as is indeed intimated when it is said, "The word of the Lord came unto Abraham in a vision;" ver. 1.

2dly. There are some things said to be done by the prophets, in their narratives of these symbolical actions, which could not be really done without sin; and therefore we may conclude, that neither did God order them, nor did they really do them; but all was transacted in the prophet's imagination, in a dream or vision only. Thus the prophet Hosea is said, at the command of God, to take a wife of whoredom, that is, a whore; and to have three children by her, which are called the children of whoredom, that is, bastards; Hos. i. 2. Those who will have this to be real fact, allege, that she is called a

wife of whoredom; which intimates, they say, that though she had been a lewd person, yet the prophet was legally married to her. But they forget, that the children which she bore him are called children of whoredom. Besides, he is ordered to "love another woman, an adulteress," chap. iii. 1, and is said to have bought or hired her for "fifteen pieces of silver, and a homer and a half of barley, to abide with him many days," ver, 2, 3: circumstances which evidently point out a lewd mistress, not a lawful wife.

Now can it be supposed, that the prophet Hosea, the chief scope of whose prophecy is to discover sin, and to denounce the judgments of God upon a people that would not be reformed, would himself be guilty of such an immoral and scandalous practice as to cohabit with one harlot after another? Much less can it be thought, that God would have commanded him so to do. It is far more likely, that the whole narrative is a relation of his prophetic dreams, in which matters were represented to his senses, that would by no means have been fit to be done in reality; which dreams furnished out an awakening and very instructive parable to the people of Israel and Judah, who were intended by the two harlots.

3dly. A farther argument to prove, that these symbolical actions were only performed in the imaginations of the prophets, is drawn from their own narratives, by the learned Mr. Smith, in his Discourse on Prophecy.* He observes, that the prophets use a different style, when relating their imaginary symbolical actions, and when speaking of what they really did. In the former case they commonly speak in the first person, as "I did so and so," and "the Lord said so and so to me;" whereas in the latter case they speak of themselves in the third person, after the manner of historians relating a matter of fact. Thus, after an account of one of these symbolical actions, namely, the prophet's getting a potter's earthen bottle, and taking with him the ancients of the people, and the ancients of the priests, and conducting them to the valley of the son of Hinnom, and there breaking the bottle before them, Jer. xix.; it follows, "then came

* See Smith's Select Discourses, Discourse on Prophecy, chap. vi. p. 218, 2d edit. Cambridge, 1673.

Jeremiah from Tophet, whither the Lord had sent him to prophecy, and he stood in the court of the Lord's house;" ver. 14. Now Mr. Smith supposes, that when the prophet thus spoke of himself in the third person, he related some real fact; and that Jeremiah, therefore, really wore a yoke on his neck, which the false prophet Hananiah broke; chap. xxviii. 10. However, this observation will hardly hold universally; for Hosea relates the story of his cohabiting with the former adulteress in the third person, chap. i, and of his cohabiting with the second in the first person; chap. iii. Yet there is no reason to believe one was real fact, any more than the other. Though this argument, therefore, must be acknowledged to be ingenious, no stress can be laid upon it. And so the two former arguments, it is presumed, are sufficient to satisfy us, that many of the Scripture narratives of the symbolical actions of the prophets are only relations of their prophetic dreams or visions.

2dly. Another way, in which secrets were revealed to the prophets, was by inspiration; that is, when something was suggested to the mind of the prophet while he was awake, without any such scenical representation to his imagination or fancy as is made in dreams and visions. The Jewish writers distinguish inspiration into several degrees, the chief of which, and indeed all that are worth our notice, are what they call רוח הקדש *ruach hakkodhesh*, or the Holy Spirit, and the *gradus Mosaicus*, the degree of Moses, which they make to be the highest of all.

The 1st, רוח הקדש *ruach hakkodhesh*, is thus distinguished by Maimonides, When a man perceives some power to arise within and rest upon him, which urgeth him to speak; insomuch that, under this impulse, he either discourses concerning arts and sciences, or utters psalms and hymns, or useful and salutary precepts for the conduct of life, or matter political and civil, or sacred and divine; and that while he is awake, and has the ordinary use and vigour of his senses; this is such a one, concerning whom it is said, that he speaks by the Holy Spirit.* And thus St. Peter says, that "prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" 2 Pet. i. 21. Such

* Maimon. More Nevoch. part ii. cap. xlv. p. 317.

was the inspiration of Zacharias, of whom it is said, that "he was filled with the Holy Ghost and prophesied," Luke i. 67; and also of his wife Elizabeth, who "was filled with the Holy Ghost, and spake with a loud voice," &c., ver. 41, 42. What they delivered was immediately suggested to their minds by the Holy Ghost. This kind of inspiration was calm and gentle, and did not throw the prophet into those fears and consternations, and disorders of body, which the prophetic dreams and visions sometimes did;* but he continued, all the time the afflatus was upon him, in full possession of himself. And by this circumstance divine inspiration was distinguished from the pseudo-prophetical spirit of the heathens, and other pretenders to prophecy; which if it did indeed, without dissimulation, enter into any person, its energy seems to have been merely on the imagination or fancy, which was thereby so disturbed, that the prophet was thrown into a sort of fury or madness. Thus Virgil represents the Sybil as distracted and raving when the prophetic afflatus came upon her, in a passage quoted before. The Pythian prophetess is described by Lucan† as full of fury, when she was inspired by the prophetic spirit, and uttering her oracles with her hair torn, and foaming at the mouth, with many antic gestures. And Cassandra is represented by Lycophron as prophesying in the same manner.‡

This sort of enthusiastic ecstasy was accounted by the primitive fathers to be a sure diagnostic of a false prophet. Hence Miltiades made it an objection against the Montanists;§ and Clemens Alexandrinus saith of those who made false pretences to prophecy, that they prophesied being in an ecstasy, like the servants of the devil.‖ Tertullian, who was a friend to the Montanists, grants they were sometimes

* See Jer. xxiii. 9; Ezek. iii. 14; Dan. vii. 15, viii. 27; Hab. iii. 2; and perhaps to this class we may also refer Isa. xxi. 2, 3, though Jonathan the targumist and some others understand the prophet as here speaking in the person of the Chaldeans, and representing the horrors and anguish that should come upon them.

† Lucan, lib. v. l. 142—218, passim.

‡ Lycoph. Cassandr. ab init.

§ Euseb. Eccles. Histor. lib. v. cap. xvii. p. 232, 233, edit. Cantab. 1720.

‖ Strom. lib. i. p. 311, D, edit. Paris, 1641.

ecstatical in their prophetic dreams or visions, but denies they fell into any rage or fury, which he seems to admit is the character of a false prophet.* St. Jerome, in his preface to Isaiah, says, "the prophets did not speak in ecstasies, neither did they speak they knew not what; nor were they, when they went about to instruct others, ignorant of what they said themselves." St. Chrysostom is of the same opinion.† "It is the property of a diviner," says he, "to be ecstatical, to undergo some violence, to be tossed and hurried about like a madman; but it is otherwise with the prophet, whose understanding is awake, and his mind in a sober and orderly temper, and he knows every thing he saith." Hence we may infer what opinion these fathers would have entertained of the ecstatic fits of the modern French prophets, Quakers, Methodists, and Moravians.

The energy of the pseudo-prophetic spirit is farther represented as irresistible by the prophets themselves; so that they could not withstand it, nor suppress its dictates, but must immediately utter what it suggested. Thus Virgil represents the Sybil, in her raving fit, as striving, but in vain, to shake off the prophetic afflatus, while it returned upon her with so much the more violence, and forced her to utter prophecies.

> At Phœbi nondum patiens, immanis in antro
> Bacchatur vates, magnum si pectore possit
> Excussisse Deum; tanto magis ille fatigat
> Os rabidum, fera cordadomans finitque premendo.
>
> Æneid. vi. l. 77, &c.

On the contrary, the true prophets were only φερομενοι απο πνευματος ἁγιου, 2 Pet. i. 21, "moved by the Holy Ghost," as we render it. The word imports a more gentle influence and suggestion, without any thing of force and violence upon the mind; such an influence as no way disturbed and hindered, but rather promoted the exercise of reason and prudence. For the verb φερω signifies to uphold, support, bear, or carry; as the tree bears fruit, John xv. 5; and as Christ is said to "uphold all things by the word of his power," Heb. i. 3, φερων ταπαντα, &c. The sense of which may perhaps be expressed by those beautiful lines of Virgil:

* Tertull. de Animâ, cap. xlv. p. 297, D. edit. Rigalt.
† Vid. Hom. xxix. in 1. Cor.

Principio cœlum, ac terras, camposque liquentes
Lucentemque globum lunæ, titaniaque astra
Spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus
Mens agitat molem, et magno se corpore miscet.
Æneid, vi. l. 724, et seq.

And the prophets of God being thus moved by the Spirit, in the full exercise of their own reason and prudence, may give light to that passage of the apostle Paul, "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets," 1 Cor. xiv. 32; or, as ὑποτασσεται may perhaps be more justly rendered, are under the direction of, or are to be ordered by the prophets; and it is most naturally interpreted by Œcumenius* and Theophylact† as spoken in opposition to the heathen prophets; who, when the afflatus was upon them, could not be silent if they would; whereas a true divine afflatus was so far subject to the reason and discretion of the prophet, that he could wait till it was proper to deliver what had been suggested to him; and, therefore, they might all, as the apostle directs, prophesy one by one, ver. 31, and so avoid that confusion and tumult, which several persons speaking together would necessarily occasion, and to which the Spirit of God did no way constrain them; 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

2dly. The highest degree of inspiration is, according to the Jewish doctors, the *gradus Mosaicus;* which Maimonides makes to excel that of any other prophet in four particulars:—

1st. That Moses received his revelation awake, and in the full use of his reason and senses; whereas God manifested himself to all other prophets by dreams and visions, when their senses were locked up, and as it were useless.

2dly. That Moses prophesied without the mediation of any angelic power, whereas all the rest prophesied by the help of the ministry of angels.

3dly. That all other prophets were afraid and troubled, and fainted when the divine afflatus was upon them. But Moses was not so affected; for the Scripture says, "God spake unto him as a man speaketh unto his friend."

4thly. That Moses could prophesy at all times, when he would, which the other prophets could not.‡

* Œcumen. Comment. in loc. vol. i. p. 564, D. edit. Paris, 1630.

† Theophyl. Comment. in Epist. in loc. p. 288, 289, edit. Lond. 1636.

‡ Vid. Maimon. de Fundament. Legis, cap. vii. sect. vi.—ix. p. 96—104.

The first and third of these distinctions differ not at all from the רוח הקדש *ruach hakkodhesh;* the second is certainly a mistake, for "the law was given by the disposition of angels, by the hand of a mediator," namely, Moses, Gal. iii. 19; and the last is quite uncertain. We dismiss them all, therefore, as not worthy any farther notice.

As for the preference which the Scripture gives to Moses above the other prophets, "There arose not a prophet since in Israel, like to Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face," Deut. xxxiv. 10; Le Clerc is for confining it to the time which had elapsed since the death of Moses to the writing of the chapter in which this passage is contained; or we may possibly extend it to all the following ages of the Old Testament dispensation.

Moses was the greatest prophet, as God delivered his law by him to Israel; as he wrought more miracles than any of the rest, ver. 11, 12; and perhaps also as he had greater intimacy with God, and had more of the divine will revealed to him than was revealed to any other; which may be the meaning of the Lord's knowing him face to face, or speaking to him "face to face," Exod. xxxiii. 11; for in such a sense the phrase of seeing "face to face" is used in the following passage of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, "Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face," chap. xiii. 12; importing the clear and perfect knowledge of the heavenly state, in contradistinction, not only to the scanty knowledge of the Jewish state and dispensation, which is compared to seeing only the shadow of things, but also to the imperfect though improved knowledge of the gospel state, which is compared to the seeing the image of a thing in a glass darkly.

3dly. Another way, in which secrets were revealed to the prophets, was by voices; as to the child Samuel; 1 Sam. iii. One would suppose, this should be as excellent a manner, and as high a degree of revelation as any whatever; and, indeed, it seems to have been the true *gradus Mosaicus,* or the manner of God's revealing the law to Moses; with whom, in the book of Exodus, he is said to have spoken face to face, as a man speaks to his friend, chap. xxxiii. 11; and in the book of Numbers, "mouth to mouth, even apparently:" which manner

of revelation is at the same time preferred to that by dreams and visions; see Numb. xii. 6—8. Nevertheless, the Jewish doctors make this, which they call the בת קול *bath kol, filiæ vox seu filia vocis,* to be the very lowest degree of prophecy, or rather to succeed in the room of prophecy. Rabbi Isaac, the author of the book Cozri, says, "There is a tradition, that the men of the great synagogue were commanded to be skilled in all sciences; principally because prophecy was never taken from them, or at least that which supplied its room, the בת קול *bath kol.*"* Dr. Lightfoot says, that both the talmudical and later rabbies make frequent mention of בת קול *bath kol,* which served under the second temple as their utmost refuge of revelation. They call it בת קול *bath kol,* or the daughter of the voice, in relation to the oracle of Urim and Thummim; which, according to them, was delivered by an articulate voice from the mercy-seat. But upon the cessation of that oracle, this came in its place, which is therefore called the daughter or successor of that voice. For an instance of the בת קול *bath kol,* the Doctor gives us this, out of a multitude that are to be found in the talmudists: "When Jonathan, the son of Uzziel, had composed the Targum of the Prophets, there came בת קול *bath kol,* and said, Who hath revealed my secrets to the sons of men? And when he went about to explain the *cherubim,* there came בת קול *bath kol,* and said, It is enough."†

But if the בת קול *bath kol* was in reality what the Jewish writers pretend, a miraculous voice from God, the daughter should seem to be equal with the mother: and it is hard to say on what account this sort of revelation was inferior to any other. Dr. Prideaux hath cleared up this difficulty, and, from another instance in the Talmud, hath shown what sort of an oracle the בת קול *bath kol* was.‡ The passage which he quotes, out of many more instances, as he says, of the same sort, is this: "Rabbi Jochanan and Rabbi Simeon Ben Lachish desiring to see the face of Rabbi Samuel, a Babylonish doctor, Let us follow, said they, the hearing of בת קול *bath kol.* Travelling therefore near a school, they heard the voice of a

* Vid. lib. Cozri, part iii. sect. xli. p. 216, 217, edit. Buxtorf. Basil, 1660.

† See Lightfoot's Harmony on Matt. iii. 16.

‡ Connect. part ii. chap. ii. sub anno 107.

boy reading these words from the First Book of Samuel, 'And Samuel died;' chap. xxv. 1. Observing this, they inferred that their friend Samuel was dead, and so they found it had happened, for Samuel of Babylon was then dead." This instance sufficiently shows us, that their בת קול *bath kol* was no such voice from Heaven as they pretended, but only a fantastical way of divination of mere human invention. They applied to בת קול *bath kol* the next words they accidentally heard from any body's mouth; and this they called a voice from Heaven, because they fancied that hereby the judgment and decree of Heaven were declared, concerning any future events, of which they desired to be pre-informed.

From this account of the בת קול *bath kol*, we may judge, how absurd it is to imagine, as several divines have done, that St. Peter refers to it, and allows, according to the Jewish notion, the voice from Heaven to be inferior to prophecy, in the following remarkable passage of his Second Epistle, which I will recite at large: "For we have not followed cunningly-devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father, honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard when we were with him in the holy mount. We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place," &c. The voice that St. Peter here speaks of was quite different from the בת קול *bath kol*; it was the voice of the same God who spake by his Spirit to the prophets; and none of them could be more sure of the divine inspiration, by which they wrote their prophecies, than St. Peter and his two companions were, of what they heard and saw on the mount of Christ's transfiguration.

It is a question, however, on what account St. Peter styles the writings of the prophets a more sure word of prophecy, *βεβαιοτερον τον προφητικον λογον*, than that voice from Heaven. Some, as Gomarus and Grotius, refer the word *βεβαιοτερον* to that voice from Heaven, by which the Old Testament prophe-

cies concerning Christ were now made more sure, or had received an additional confirmation; for βεβαιοω, in several places of the New Testament, signifies to confirm.* Otherwise, it may be thus understood: The writings of the ancient prophets had been more confirmed by the actual accomplishment of a number of their own predictions, than the testimony of these three apostles, who declared they had heard the voice from Heaven, had yet been; and the refore, to other persons they were βεβαιοτερος λογος, a word more fully confirmed than this voice from Heaven, especially to the Jews, who were firmly established in the belief of the divine inspiration of the Old Testament Prophets, and to them the apostle is chiefly writing.

The sense in which Dr. Sherlock understands this passage seems to be the easiest and most natural; namely, that the only event to which the word prophecy here refers, is "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ;" that is, his second glorious appearance for the destruction of his enemies, and the salvation of his people. Now it was a strong presumption, that Christ would come in glory, that they had already seen him glorified on the mount of transfiguration; and it was a farther evidence of his power to deliver his servants, that God had openly declared him to be his well-beloved Son; but to assure them, that he would so come, and so use his power, they had "a more sure word of prophecy," the very word of God, speaking by his prophets, both of the Old and the New Testament, to whom all futurity is known, to assure us of the certainty of this future event.†

It is possible the Jews might learn their divination by בת קול *bath kol* from the heathens, or the heathens a like sort of divination from the Jews. For the *bath kol* was much of the same kind with the *Sortes Homericæ*, and *Sortes Virgilianæ*, which were much practised by the Greeks and Romans, especially after their other oracles ceased on the coming of Christ. The difference was, the Jews took their oracle from the first words they heard any body pronounce; the heathens, from the first they cast their eyes upon, on open-

* This appears from 2 Pet. iii. 1, 2, compared with 1 Pet. i. 1.

† See Sherlock's Discourses on Prophecy, disc. i. especially p. 20—23.

ing Homer or Virgil, in which they endeavoured to discover a meaning suitable to the matter concerning which they inquired.*

The Christians, when their religion came to be corrupted, adopted this trick of divination from the heathens, only using the Bible instead of Homer or Virgil. The practice appears to have been as ancient as Austin, who lived in the fourth century. He mentions it in his hundred and ninth epistle to Januarius; and though he disallows it in secular, he seems to approve it in spiritual affairs. Dr. Prideaux says it obtained mostly in the west, especially in France, where for several ages it was the practice, on the consecration of a new bishop, to consult the Bible concerning him, in this way of divination, by which they made a judgment of his life, and manners, and future behaviour; and this they made a part of their public offices.†

* Potter's Antiquities, vol. i. chap. xv. p. 302.

Dr. Welwood, in his Memoirs, tells this remarkable story of King Charles I., that, being at Oxford during the civil wars, he went to see the public library, where he was showed a fine edition of Virgil. And Lord Falkland, to divert the king, would have him make trial of his fortune by the Sortes Virgilianæ; upon which the king opened the book at Dido's imprecation against Æneas, where she wished he might be conquered by his enemies, his friends slain in battle, and himself come to an untimely death.

At bello audacis populi vexatus et armis,
Finibus extorris, complexu avulsus Jüli,
Auxilium imploret, videatque indigna suorum
Funera: nec cum se sub leges pacis iniquæ
Tradiderit, regno aut optatâ luce fruatur;
Sed cadat ante diem, mediâque inhumatus arenâ.
Hæc precor. Æneid, iv. l. 615—622.

The king seemed concerned at the augury: upon which Lord Falkland would try his fortune in the same manner; but the place he stumbled upon was more suited to his destiny than the other was to the king's, being the expressions of Evander upon the untimely death of his son Pallas:

Non hæc, O Palla, dederas promissa parenti,
Cautius ut sævo velles te credere Marti.
Haud ignarus eram, quantum nova gloria in armis
Et prædulce decus primo certamine posset.
Primitiæ juvenis miseræ, bellique propinqui
Dura rudimenta! Æneid, xi. l. 152—157.

† Prideaux's Connect. part ii. book v. p. 463, 464, edit. 10. See also Du Fresne's Glossar. in voc. Sortes Sanctorum.

We have many instances in history of the use of these *Sortes Sanctorum*, as they were called, though they were condemned by the council of Agda, anno 506, at the time they were beginning to take footing in France.* However, blind superstition prevailed above the decree of the council for several ages, till more light and knowledge springing up at the Reformation, those fooleries, which had so long obtained among Heathens, Jews, and Christians, are now in a manner extinguished. Thus much for the third way of revelation by voices.

As for the fourth, namely, by angels, there seems to be no reason to make it, as the Jews do, distinct from the three former; since Moses received the law that was revealed to him by the "ministry of angels;" Gal. iii. 19. Probably the visions which the prophets saw, as well as the voices which they heard, were formed by angels: see Isa. vi. 3; Dan. viii. 16, 17; Rev. v. 2, &c. And how far their ministry might be employed in suggesting things more immediately to the minds of the prophets, who can pretend to determine? Thus much for the manner in which God revealed secrets to the prophets.

Godwin observes, that, for the propagation of learning, colleges and schools were in divers places erected for the prophets. The first intimation we have in Scripture of these schools is in a passage of the First Book of Samuel, where we read of "a company of prophets coming down from the high place with a psaltery, a tabret, a pipe, and a harp before them, and they did prophesy;" 1 Sam. x. 5. They are supposed to be the students in a college of prophets at גבעת *gibnath*, or "the hill," as we render it, "of God." Our translators elsewhere retain the same Hebrew word, as supposing it to be the proper name of a place, 1 Sam. xiii. 3; "Jonathan smote the garrison of the Philistines that was in Geba." Some persons have imagined, that the ark, or at least a synagogue, or some place of public worship, was at this time at Geba, and that this is the reason of its being styled in the former passage גבעת האלהים *gibnath Haelohim*, the hill of God. We read afterward of such another company of prophets at Naioth in Ramah, "prophesying, and Samuel standing as appointed over them;" 1 Sam. xix. 19, 20. Ramah, other-

* Canon. xlii. Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Anno 506, vol. vi. p. 112.

wise called Ramathaim-zophim, was Samuel's birth-place, where his parents lived; 1 Sam. i. 1, compared with ver. 19. Some imagine it was called צפים *tsophim*, from צפה *tsaphah*, *speculatus est*, because of the school of the prophets, or seers, that was there; for this title צפה *tsopheh*, is given to the prophet Ezekiel: "I have made thee a watchman, צפה *tsopheh*, to the house of Israel;" Ezek. iii. 17.

The students in these colleges were called sons of the prophets, who are frequently mentioned in after ages, even in the most degenerate times. Thus we read of the sons of the prophets that were at Bethel, 2 Kings ii. 3; and of another school at Jericho, ver. 5; and of the sons of the prophets at Gilgal; chap. iv. 38. It should seem, that these sons of the prophets were very numerous; for of this sort were probably the prophets of the Lord, whom Jezebel cut off; "but Obadiah took an hundred of them, and hid them by fifty in a cave;" 1 Kings xviii. 4. In these schools young men were educated under a proper master, who was commonly, if not always, an inspired prophet, in the knowledge of religion and in sacred music (see 1 Sam. x. 5, and xix. 20), and were thereby qualified to be public preachers, which seems to have been part of the business of the prophets on the sabbath-days and festivals; 2 Kings iv 23. It should seem, that God generally chose the prophets, whom he inspired, out of these schools. Amos, therefore, speaks of it as an extraordinary case, that though he was not one of the sons of the prophets, but an herdman, "yet the Lord took him as he followed the flock, and said unto him, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel;" Amos vii. 14, 15. That it was usual for some of these schools, or at least for their tutors, to be endued with a prophetic spirit, appears from the relation in the Second Book of Kings, of the prophecies concerning the ascent of Elijah, delivered to Elisha by the sons of the prophets, both at Jericho and at Bethel; 2 Kings ii. 3. 5. The houses in which they lived, were generally mean, and of their own building; chap. vi. 2—4. Their food was chiefly pottage of herbs, chap. iv. 38, 39, unless when the people sent them some better provision, as bread, parched corn, honey, dried fruits, and the like: 1 Kings xiv. 3; 2 Kings iv. 42. Their dress was plain and coarse, tied about with a leathern girdle: Zech. xiii. 4;

2 Kings i. 8. Riches were no temptation to them; therefore Elisha not only refused Naaman's presents, but punished his servant Gehazi very severely for clandestinely obtaining a small share of them; 2 Kings v. 15, &c. This recluse and abstemious way of life, together with the meanness of their attire, gave them so strange an air, especially among the courtiers, that they looked upon them as no better than madmen; chap. ix. 11. It was, perhaps, the uncouth dress and appearance of the prophet Elisha, which made the children at Bethel follow and mock him; chap. ii. 23. The freedom which the prophets used in reproving even princes for their evil deeds, frequently exposed them to persecution, imprisonment, and sometimes to death, under the reigns of wicked kings, such as Ahab and Manasseh. Nevertheless, in the main they were much respected, and treated with great reverence and regard by the better and wiser sort of people, even those of the highest rank; 1 Kings xviii. 7; 2 Kings i. 13, and xiii. 14. This is all we certainly know of the prophets and their schools.* As for the account which some have ventured to give, of their living in perpetual celibacy, poverty, and the like, in the manner of the monks and friars among the Papists, it is mere fancy and imagination; it being certain, that several of the prophets were married, and had children, particularly Samuel, Ezekiel, and Isaiah, whose wife is called a prophetess; Isa. viii. 3. And it was the widow of one of the sons of the prophets, whose oil Elisha miraculously multiplied; 2 Kings iv. 1. Huldah, the prophetess, dwelt in Jerusalem in the college, chap. xxii. 14, probably in the college of the sons of the prophets, her husband Shallum being, it is likely, one of the number. So much for the prophets.

Next to the prophets Godwin speaks of the wise men, חכמים *chachamim*, from חכם *chacham, sapuit;* a title applied in general to such as were skilful in the law, and who taught and explained it to others. Dr. Lightfoot, from the rabbies, speaks of a certain officer in the Sanhedrim, who was called the חכם *chacham*, κατ' εξοχην. But in what his dignity and office consisted is very uncertain.† What the wise men were

* Vide Vitring. de Synag. Vet. lib. i. part ii. cap. vi. vii.

† See Horæ Hebraicæ in Luc. x. 25.

in the Scripture sense of that appellation appears from hence, that those who in the twenty-third of St. Matthew are called σοφοι, ver. 34, in the parallel place in St. Luke are styled αποστολοι, chap. xi. 49, not meaning in particular those twelve disciples of Christ, who were ordained to be witnesses of his resurrection, and the first preachers of his gospel; for the apostles, or wise men here spoken of, were such as in former ages had been killed by the Jews, Matt. xxiii. 35, and they are called αποστολοι, from αποστελλω, *mitto*, only as being sent from God: as it is afterwards expressed, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest, τους απεσταλμενους προς αυτην, persons whom God hath sent;" ver. 37. The difference between prophets and wise men, in those passages, is, probably, that the former spoke, sometimes, at least, by inspiration, and occasionally predicted things to come; the latter were uninspired preachers, well skilled in the Scriptures, and sent of God by a providential mission, as ordinary ministers now are.

In the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the apostle seems to speak of certain wise men with some degree of contempt: "Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" Chap. i. 20. But perhaps he here refers, not to the Jewish חכמים *chachamim*, but to the Gentile philosophers, who, as Godwin observes, affected to be called σοφοι, till Pythagoras introduced the more modest title φιλοσοφοι. There is no great reason to doubt that this was his meaning, because the wisdom of the wise, ver. 19, of which he spoke just before, signifies the wisdom of the heathen world, by which, as he afterward declares, they knew not God, ver. 21; which was true, not of the Jews, but only of the Gentiles: and these Grecian σοφοι were the persons to whom the preaching of Christ crucified was foolishness; ver. 23. Again, when the same apostle says, that he is a debtor, σοφοις τε και ανοητοις, Rom. i. 14, he means the learned and unlearned, to the philosophers and common people.

It is farther observed, that the title חכם *chacham*, with the Jews, and σοφος, with the Gentiles, were given to such as

were skilful in manual arts. Homer accounts such to be taught by Minerva, the goddess of wisdom.

> Τεκτονος εν παλαμησι δαημονος, ος ρα τε πασης
> Ευ ειδη σοφιης ὑποθημοσυνεσιν Αθηνης.
>
> Iliad, xv. l. 411.

And to this some think the apostle alludes, when he compares himself to a σοφος αρχιτεκτων, a wise master-builder; 1 Cor. iii. 10.

Of the Scribes.

The Hebrew word ספר *sopher*, which we render Scribe, is derived from the root ספר *saphar*, *numeravit*, from whence, I suppose, comes the English word cypher; or from the noun ספר *sepher*, *enumeratio*, or *liber*, just as the Latin *librarius* and *libellarius* are derived from *liber*. Accordingly, the Targum renders ספרי *sophere* by לבלרין *labhlarin*, Esther iii. 12; chap. viii. 9; a word which, as well as many others in the Chaldee and Syriac tongues, is evidently of Latin original. The Septuagint renders ספר *sopher*, by γραμματευς, from γραμμα, *litera*.

The Scribes, therefore, according to the etymological meaning of the term, were persons some way employed about books, writings, numbers, or accounts, in transcribing, reading, explaining, &c. Now, according to these various employments, there were several sorts of Scribes. However, most authors reduce them to two general heads, or classes, civil and ecclesiastical Scribes. As the word כהן *cohèn*, which in general signifies an immediate attendant on a king, is applied either to nobles in the courts of earthly princes, or to the priests who attended the service of God the King of Israel in his temple; so is the word Scribe applied, both to those persons who were employed about any kind of civil writings or records, and to such as addicted themselves to studying, transcribing, and explaining the holy Scriptures. Of the civil Scribes there were doubtless various ranks and degrees, from the common scrivener to the principal secretary of state, in which office we find Seraiah, in the reign of king David, who is ranked with the chief officers of the kingdom, 2 Sam. viii.

17; Shebna, in the reign of Hezekiah, 2 Kings xviii. 18; Shaphan, in the reign of Josiah, chap. xxii. 3; Elishama, in the reign of Jehoiakim, who is numbered among the princes; Jer. xxxvi. 12. It is probable the next Scribe in office to the principal secretary of state, was the secretary of war, called the "principal Scribe of the host, who mustered the people of the land;" 2 Kings xxv. 19. It is reasonably supposed this is the officer referred to in the following passage of Isaiah: "Where is the Scribe? Where is the receiver? Where is he that counteth the towers?" Chap. xxxiii. 18. Which both Grotius and Lowth understand to be spoken in a way of triumph over the king of Assyria, whose defeat the prophet had just before predicted; whereupon the Israelites should reflect with pleasure on the dangers they had escaped, and in a triumphant manner inquire, Where is now the Scribe, or muster-master of the host, who threatened our destruction? Where is the receiver, or collector of those oppressive taxes, that were imposed on us by the enemy? And where is he that counted the towers?—meaning, it is likely, the chief engineer of the army, or master of the artillery and ammunition.

But besides these principal Scribes or secretaries, we read of numbers of a lower order, as of the "families of the Scribes which dwelt at Jabez," 1 Chron. ii. 55, and of the Scribes, as well as the officers and porters, that were of the tribe of Levi; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 13. It is probable some of these were under-secretaries and clerks to the principal Scribes, like the Scribes of king Ahasuerus before mentioned; others of them might be scriveners employed in drawing deeds, contracts, &c.; or in writing letters, and any other business of penmanship; like Baruch, the Scribe, who wrote Jeremiah's prophecy from his mouth, Jer. xxxvi. 4 and 32, and who had probably been before employed by Jeremiah to draw the deed of the purchase of the field, which he bought of his uncle's son; chap. xxxii. 12—14. Such Scribes are referred to in the forty-fifth Psalm: "My tongue is as the pen of a ready Scribe;" Psalm. xlv. 1.

It is not unlikely, that others of these inferior Scribes might be schoolmasters, who, as the Jewish doctors tell us, were chiefly of the tribe of Simeon; and that Jacob's prophetic curse upon this tribe, "that they should be divided in Jacob,

and scattered in Israel,"* was hereby accomplished. However, we have no evidence of this in Scripture, which gives us another clear account of the fulfilment of that prophecy, first, by an inheritance being assigned that tribe, upon the original division of the land of Canaan, within the inheritance of the children of Judah, Josh. xix. 1; and afterward, when that tribe was increased, in Hezekiah's time, by their being obliged to seek out new settlements for a part of it at Gedor, and at Mount Seir; 1 Chron. iv. 39, *et seq.* We come now to treat,

2dly. Of the ecclesiastical Scribes, who are frequently mentioned in the New Testament. According to Lightfoot, these were the learned of the nation, who expounded the law, and taught it to the people,† and they are, therefore, sometimes called *νομοδιδασκαλοι*, "doctors of the law;" for those who, in the fifth chapter of St. Luke, are styled Pharisees and doctors of the law, ver. 17, are soon afterward called Pharisees and Scribes, ver. 21. And that the *νομικοι*, so often mentioned in the New Testament, and rendered lawyers, were no other than Scribes, appears from hence, that he who, in the twenty-second of St. Matthew ver. 35, is called *νομικος*, a lawyer, is said in the twelfth of St. Mark, ver. 28, to be *εις των γραμματεων*, one of the Scribes. Nevertheless, Drusius,‡ Trigland,§ Camero,‖ and some others, conceive there must have been some distinction between the Scribes and the lawyers; because when our Saviour had reproached the Scribes and Pharisees with their hypocrisy, Luke xi. 44, it is added, that "one of the lawyers answered, and said unto him, Master, thus saying thou reproachest us also." However, the elder Spanheim imagines, that this passage rather proves the lawyers and the Scribes to have been the same, than the contrary; for he observes, that our Saviour having,

* Gen. xlix. 7. See the Jerusalem Targum in loc.; R. Solomon, as quoted by Christoph. Cartwright (Elect. Targumico-Rabbin. in loc.), saith, "Non sunt tibi pauperes scribæ, et pædagogi, nisi ex Simeone, ut essent dispersi."

† Horæ Hebr. Luc. x. 25.

‡ Drusius de Tribus Sectis Judæor. lib. ii. cap. xiii. edit. Trigland. tom. i. p. 249.

§ Triglandii Diatribe de Sectâ Karæor. cap. vi. p. 58, et seq.

‖ Camer. Annot. in Matt. xxii. 32, apud Criticos Sacros.

in his preceding discourse, ver. 39, *et seq.*, only reproached the Pharisees, and denounced woes upon them, at length, ver. 44, joins the Scribes with them: "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites," &c. Immediately upon which, the lawyer takes fire, and resents his reproaching them also, them as well as the Pharisees; from whence it appears, the lawyers, otherwise called Scribes, were the persons here intended. Accordingly, the Syriac version, Luke xi. 45, renders *νομικος*, ספרא *sophere*, Scribe.*

That Scribe was a general name or title of all who studied and were teachers of the law and of religion at the time of writing the Targum, appears from its calling the prophets several times Scribes; as in the First Book of Samuel it is said concerning Saul, that "a company of Scribes met him; and they saw that he was prophesying among the Scribes:" and they said, "Is Saul also among the Scribes?" chap. x. 10, 11. Again, in the prophecy of Isaiah, "The Scribe that teacheth lies, he is the tail;" chap. ix. 15.

Scribe, then, is not the name of a sect, as Godwin seems to imagine, but, as Casaubon† shows, of an office; nor is it true what the former saith, that the Scribes, cleaving to the written word more than the Pharisees, who adhered to the traditions, were from thence called textmen. He confounds the Scribes with the Karaites, a sect that adhered to the written Scriptures, and rejected all traditions. The Scribes, for the most part, were Pharisees, the most popular and flourishing sect among the Jews, and they are therefore censured by our Saviour along with them, for burdening the people with their traditionary precepts; Matt. xxiii. 2. 4. There is mention indeed, in the Acts, of the "Scribes that were of the Pharisees' part," chap. xxiii. 9, in the contention between them and the Sadducees, as if they were some other sect distinct from the Pharisees, who joined them on this occasion. But *οἱ γραμματεις του μερους των Φαρισαιων* may be rendered, agreeable to the Syriac version, the Scribes who were of the Pha-

* Vid. Spanheim. Dubia Evangel. part ii. Dub. xxxviii. xxxix. xl. sect. vii. p. 398, 399, edit. Genev. 1658.

† Casaubon. Exercitat. in Baron. annal. exerc. i. apparat. viii. p. 52, 53, edit. Genev. 1655.

risees' party or sect; and who, being the more learned persons of the party, undertook to dispute against the Sadducees.

Upon the whole, the Scribes were the preaching clergy among the Jews, and whilst the priests attended the sacrifices, they instructed the people. It was on account of their supposed skill in the Scriptures, that, when Herod was anxious to know, where, according to the prophecies, the Messiah should be born, he "gathered all the chief priests and Scribes of the people together," to obtain information; Matt. ii. 4.

Joseph Scaliger endeavours to establish a distinction between the γραμματεις του λαου, the Scribes of the people, as they are here called, and the γραμματεις του νομου, the Scribes of the law. The former he makes to be a sort of public notaries, whose employment was in secular business; the latter, preachers and expounders of the law.* But besides that we no where meet in Scripture with the phrase γραμματεις του νομου, the Scribes of the law, it is evident, that the γραμματεις του λαου, the Scribes of the people, whom Herod consulted, were applied to on account of their skill in explaining Scripture prophecies. And they seem to have been in considerable reputation for their skill in this respect, which is intimated in the question that the disciples put to Christ, "Why then say the Scribes, that Elias must first come?" Matt. xvii. 10. They were probably called Scribes of the people, because they were their stated and ordinary teachers. And their being, in virtue of their office, public speakers, is the reason, I suppose, that the officers שטרים *shoterim*, mentioned in the book of Deuteronomy, who were to speak to the people, chap. xx. 5. 9, are in the Samaritan version styled סופרים *sopherim*, and in the Septuagint, γραμματεις, or Scribes. That they were, generally, at least, public preachers, may be inferred from its being said, that Christ "taught as one having authority, and not as the Scribes;" Mark i. 22. This assertion gives occasion to Dr. Lightfoot to observe three heads of difference between the teaching of the Scribes and that of Christ:

1st. They taught chiefly the traditions of the fathers; our Saviour, the sound and self-grounded word of God. And when he bade his disciples call no man father upon earth, he

* Scaliger. Elench. Trihæres, cap. xi. p. 404, edit. Trigland.

meant it in opposition to the vain traditions which the Scribes taught, namely, the traditions of the fathers.

2dly. The teaching of the Scribes was especially about external, carnal, and trivial rites; as that they should wash their hands before eating, and the like, Matt. xv. 1, 2; whereas Christ taught the spiritual and weighty doctrines of faith, repentance, renovation, charity, &c.

3dly. The teaching of the Scribes was litigious: they toiled in intricate and endless disputes, and were therefore probably the preachers to whom the apostle refers, in the sixth chapter of the First Epistle to Timothy, whom he describes as conceited and ignorant, doting about questions and strife of words, from whence proceed envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, &c. ver. 3—5; whereas our Saviour's preaching was plain and convincing.*

We have a farther intimation, concerning the manner of their teaching in our Saviour's time, in the eleventh chapter of St. Luke, ver. 52, where, instead of leading the people into an acquaintance with true religion, they are charged with taking away the key of knowledge, by leading them off from attending to the Scriptures, by insisting so much on traditions, and especially by the false interpretations of the prophecies relating to the Messiah, whereby the people were kept from believing on him now he was actually come.

Camero observes, that a key was delivered to each Scribe, as a badge of his office, when he first entered upon it; to which perhaps our Saviour here alludes.†

Spanheim farther remarks,‡ that what is here charged upon the lawyers, is elsewhere charged upon the Scribes, Matt. xxiii. 13; which is a farther evidence, that the lawyers and the Scribes were the same. Nevertheless, he is ready to admit, that the lawyers might be a superior sort of Scribes; yet all the Scribes might not be lawyers.

That there were different ranks and degrees of these Scribes is inferred from the sixth chapter of the Second Book of Maccabees, ver. 18, where Eleazar is said to be τις των πρωτευοντων γραμματεων, "one of the principal Scribes." Such a one was

* Harmony on Mark i. 22.

† Camer. in Luc. xi. 52, apud Criticos Sacros.

‡ Spanheim, ubi supra.

Gamaliel; Acts v. 34. Josephus also speaks of ἱερογραμματεις, sacred Scribes,* who judged of the signs which portended the destruction of Jerusalem; they were probably of superior dignity, and, as their name seems to import, priests as well as Scribes.

However, notwithstanding the corrupt doctrine and instructions which the Scribes delivered in their public teaching, they are said to sit in Moses's seat, and our Saviour charges his disciples to observe and do whatever they bid them do; Matt. xxiii. 2, 3. By Moses's seat, Dr. Lightfoot understands the seat of judicature, as they were members of the Sanhedrim;† but the advice which Christ gives to observe and do what they directed or commanded, or to follow their good instructions in opposition to their bad example, ver. 3, evidently refers to their teaching rather than to their judging. It is therefore a more probable conjecture, that Moses's seat here means the chair or pulpit, out of which the Scribes, in the synagogues, used to deliver their discourses sitting, as the custom then was, Matt. v. 1, 2; though we read, that, in former times, Ezra stood upon a pulpit of wood, when he read and explained the law to the people; Nehem. viii. 4. It was called the chair or seat of Moses, probably because the books of Moses were read and explained from it. Now, as for our Saviour's charging his disciples to do and observe whatsoever these corrupt preachers bid them, it must certainly be understood only so far as they sat in the chair of Moses, or delivered the dictates of the law; for if he had required of his disciples an absolute submission to their dictates, he would in effect have forbid their believing in himself, whom the Scribes rejected.

Though the Pharisees are continually joined with the Scribes, particularly in the passage we have been just considering, where "the Scribes and the Pharisees are said to sit in Moses's seat;" we have, however, no reason to think any of the Pharisees were public preachers by office, except those who were Scribes. But the true account of this phrase, Scribes and Pharisees, is, I apprehend, either that it means Scribes who were Pharisees, or Pharisaical Scribes, the Scribes being generally

* Joseph. de Bell. Judaic. lib. vi. cap. v. sect. iii. p. 388, edit. Haverc.

† Lightfoot, Horæ Hebr. in loc.

of that sect; or else it might be common for those Pharisees who were not Scribes, to teach the people occasionally, though they were in no ecclesiastical office; as other laymen were allowed to do. Thus Christ, who was certainly in no ecclesiastical office among the Jews, "went about Galilee teaching in their synagogues," Matt. iv. 23; and Paul, with the leave of the ruler, preached in the synagogue at Antioch; Acts xiii. 15, 16. But this we shall have occasion to consider more particularly, when we treat concerning the synagogues.

The Scribes appear to have been men of great power and authority in the state; Matt. xx. 18. For it is predicted of them, and of the chief priests, that they should condemn our Saviour to death. But I do not apprehend, that this was in virtue of their office as Scribes, but partly by reason of their influence as public preachers, and partly as many of them were members of the Sanhedrim, which was then the supreme court of judicature.

As for the origin of this office, some make it to be as ancient as Ezra, who is said to be a ready Scribe in the law of Moses; chap. vii. 6. But his being called a Scribe, which was a general title given to men of literature, as has been shown before, will not prove the office of ecclesiastical Scribes, such as we find in our Saviour's time, to have been of so high antiquity. It is most likely, that it grew up by degrees, after the spirit of prophecy ceased from among the Jews; for when they had no prophet to apply to in any doubt about doctrine or worship, they fell into disputes, and split into sects and parties; which made a set of men necessary, whose proper business it should be to apply themselves to the study of the law, in order to explain and teach it to the people.*

Of the Masorites.

Before we dismiss the Scribes, it will be proper to say something of the Masorets, or Masorites, who were a lower sort of Scribes. Their profession was to write out copies of the Hebrew Scriptures; to teach the true reading of them,

* See on this subject, Spanheim, Dubia Evang. part. ii. dub. xxxviii.—xl. p. 392—405; Leusden. Philolog. Hebræo-Mixt. dissert. xxiii.

and criticise upon them. Their work is called Masora, from מסר *masar*, *tradidit*, because, say the Jews, when God gave the law to Moses at Mount Sinai, he taught him first, the true reading of it, and secondly, its true interpretation; and that both these were handed down by oral tradition, from generation to generation, till at length they were committed to writing.* The former of these, namely, the true reading, is the subject of the Masora; the latter, or true interpretation, of the Mishna and Gemara, which we shall give you an account of in another place.

The age when the Masorites first rose is somewhat doubtful. Archbishop Usher places them before Jerome; Capel, at the end of the fifth century.† Father Morin asserts the Masorites did not appear till the tenth century. Elias Levita, a Jew, who bestowed twenty years' labour on explaining the Masora, makes the first compilers of it to be the Jews of the famous school of Tiberias, about five hundred years after Christ;‡ Basnage says, that we seek in vain for the time of the Masorites; since they were not a society, nor even a succession of men, who applied themselves to this study for a certain number of years, and afterward disappeared; but the Masora is the work of a great number of grammarians, who, without associating and communicating their notions, composed this collection of criticisms on the Hebrew text.§ However, if, according to Elias Levita, the school of Tiberias first gathered them into one volume, and so properly begun

* Mishn. tit. Pirke Abhoth, cap. i.; et Maimon. in præfat. ad Jad Chazakah: Præcepta, que Mosi tradita sunt in Sinai, ea omnia data sunt cum expositione suâ, juxta illud Exod. xxiv. 12. "Et dabo tibi tabulas lapideas, et legem, et mandatum," &c. legem sc. scriptam; et mandatum, id est, expositionem ejus. See the passage at large, in De Voisin's Observat. ad Pugionem Fidei, p. 9. Elias Levita asserts, that the Masora was handed down in like manner from Moses, till it was reduced to writing, as he saith, by the doctors of the school of Tiberias.—Elias Levita in præf. lib. iii. Masoreth hamasoreth. See also the book Cozri, p. 199, edit. Buxtorf. 1660.

† Capelli Critic. Sacr. lib. vi. cap. iv. p. 391.

‡ Elias Levita, ubi supra.

§ Basnage, in his History of the Jews, book iii. chap. ix. sect. vii. p. 182, mentions the opinions of Usher and Morin, as well as of Capel and Levita, but endeavours to prove, sect. ix., that Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, about the year 1030, were the true inventors of the Masora.

the work which is now called the Masora, of which there is both a greater and a less, printed at Venice and at Basil, it hath nevertheless been enlarged since the time of that school; for there were Masorites long afterward, even as late as about A. D. 1030; particularly Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, who were very famous, and the last of the profession. Each of these published a copy of the whole Hebrew text, as correct, saith Dr. Prideaux, as they could make it. The eastern Jews have followed that of Ben-Naphtali, and the western that of Ben-Asher; and all that has been done since is to copy after them, without making any more corrections, or masoretical criticisms.*

Their work regards merely the letter of the Hebrew text: in which they have, first, fixed the true reading by vowels and accents; though whether these points were originally annexed to the Hebrew letters by them, is a matter of dispute, which we shall consider in another place.

They have, secondly, numbered not only the chapters and sections, but the verses, words, and letters of the text. They find, accordingly, in the Pentateuch 5245 verses, and in the whole Bible 23,206. Some indeed have doubted, whether they carried their diligence so far as to number the letters. But Father Simon attests that he had seen a MS. Masora, which numbered in the book of Genesis 12 great sections, 43 sedarim, or orders, 1534 verses, 20,713 words, and 78,100 letters.† The Masora is therefore called by the Jews, the hedge or fence of the law; inasmuch as this numbering the verses, words, and letters, is a means of preserving it from being altered and corrupted. Thus it is said in the Mishna, that tithes are the fences of riches, vows are the fences of sanctity, silence is the fence of wisdom, and the Masora is the fence of the law.‡ Hence, also, Aben-Ezra calls the Masorites the keepers of the walls of the holy city.§

* Prideaux's Connect. part i. book v. vol. ii. p. 516, edit. 10.

† Vid. Simon. Histr. Critic. Vet. Test. lib. i. cap. xxvi. p. 128, Paris, 1681.

‡ Pirke Abhoth, cap. iii. sect. xiii. tom. iv. p. 442, edit. Surenhus.

§ Aben-Ezra, quoted by Carpzovius, Critic. Sacr. part i. cap. vi. p. 288, Lipsiæ, 1728.

They have, thirdly, marked whatever irregularities are found in any of the letters of the Hebrew text; as that in some words one letter is of a larger (vid. Deut. vi. 4), in others, of a less (vid. Gen. ii. 4) size, than the rest. Of the former sort they discover thirty-one instances; of the latter, thirty-three. They observe four words in which one letter is suspended, or placed somewhat higher than the rest (vid. Judges xviii. 30); nine places, in which the letter *nun* is inverted (vid. Numb. x. 35); and several places where the final letters are not used at the end of words; and others, where they are used in the middle.

They are likewise very fruitful in finding out reasons for these irregularities, and mysteries in them. Thus the great *vau* in the word, גחון *gachon*, in the forty-second verse of the eleventh chapter of Leviticus, is to signify, that it is just the middle of the Pentateuch. The last letter both of the first and last word of this sentence in the sixth chapter of Deuteronomy, ver. 4, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord," is of an extraordinary size, in order to denote the extraordinary weight of that sentence, and the peculiar attention it deserves. The *caph* in the word לבכתה *libhchothah*, in the second verse of the twenty-third chapter of Genesis, where Abraham is said to weep for Sarah, is of a lesser size, to signify the moderation of his mourning, she being an old woman.

They are, fourthly, supposed to be the authors of the *keri* and *chethibh*, or the marginal corrections of the text in our Hebrew Bibles; among which they have noted transpositions of letters in some words, as יבחר *jebuchar*, for יחבר *jechubar*, in the ninth chapter of Ecclesiastes, and the fourth verse; and one word put for another, as ובני *ubenè* for ובן *uben*, in the forty-sixth chapter of Genesis, and the twenty-third verse. But we shall have occasion to take farther notice of the *keri* and *chethibh*, when we come to treat of the Hebrew language.

From this short specimen of the works of the Masorites, you will probably conceive a higher opinion of their industry and diligence than of their judgment. As for the irregularities in the letters, upon which they have commented, it being

reasonable to suppose that these happened at first by mere accident in transcribing, they would have discovered more good sense if they had corrected them, than in devising reasons for them, and assigning mystical interpretations to them.

Dr. Prideaux saith, those who were the authors of the Masora now extant, were a monstrous trifling set of men, whose criticisms and observations went no higher than numbering the verses, words, and letters, of every book in the Hebrew Bible, marking which was the middle word, verse, or letter, in each of them, and making of such other poor and low remarks concerning them, as are not worth reading or regarding, whatever Richard Simon the Frenchman may say to the contrary.*

The דרשנים *durshanim*, whom Godwin supposes to be intended by the disputers of this world, mentioned in the first chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, ver. 20, were likewise a sort of Scribes or doctors of the law. There was a threefold exposition of the law in vogue among the Jews, in their later and corrupt ages; the first, a literal explication of the written law, which they called מקרא *mikra;* the second, consisting of the traditions of the fathers, styled the משנה *mishna*, with a comment upon them styled the גמרה *gemara*, both together called the *talmud;* the third, a *mystic* and *allegorical* exposition of the Scriptures, called מדרש *midrash*, or commentary κατ' ἐξοχην.† The apostle's allegory of Sara and Hagar, with their sons, by which he illustrates the two covenants, in the Epistle to the Galatians, chap. iv., is somewhat in this style, and was, therefore, admirably suited to the taste of the persons whom he is there addressing.

The Cabalists likewise were a sort of mystical doctors, who discovered a world of mystery in the letters of the sacred text, either by considering their numeral power, or by changing and transposing them in different ways, according to the rules of their art. By these means they extracted senses from the

* See Prideaux's Connect. part i. book v. sub anno 446. For a larger account of the Masorites and their works, consult, besides the authors already quoted, Buxtorfii Tiberias; Carpzovii Critica Sacra, part i. cap. vi.; and Walton. Prolegom. viii. ad Bibl. Polyglot.

† Vid. Lightfoot. Hor. Hebraic. in Luc. x. 25.

sacred oracles, very different from those which the expression seemed naturally to import, or which were ever intended by the authors.*

We have before offered some reasons for believing that by the σοφος, mentioned in the first chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, ver. 20, are meant Gentile philosophers, and not, as Godwin seems to imagine, Jewish teachers of traditions. Whether the disputer of this world, συζητητης του αιωνος τουτου, referred to the Jewish allegorical doctors, or the Gentile natural philosophers, as distinguished from the moral philosophers, called σοφοι, is differently conjectured by the learned, but very hard to be determined with certainty.

* A large account of the cabalistic art, as practised, not only by Jews, but by heathens and Christians, may be seen in Basnage's History of the Jews, book iii. chap. x.—xxviii.

CHAPTER VII.

OF THE TITLE RABBI.

The title Rabbi, with several others from the same root, רבב *rabhabh, magnus est, vel multiplicatus est,* began first to be assumed, according to Godwin, as a distinguishing title of honour by men of learning, about the time of the birth of Christ. We find it anciently given, indeed, to several magistrates and officers of state. In the Book of Esther, it is said, the king appointed כל-רב ביתו *col-rab betho,* which we render "all the officers of his house;" chap. i. 8. In Jeremiah we read of the רבי המלך *rabbè hammelek,* "the princes of the king;" chap. xli. 1. In the Book of Job, it is said, that the רבים *rabbim,* which we render "great men, are not always wise," chap. xxxii. 9 Engl., 10 Heb.; a rendering, which I apprehend well expresses the original meaning of the word. It was not therefore in those days properly a title of honour, belonging to any particular office or dignity, in church or state; but all who were of superior rank and condition in life, were called רבים *rabbim.* We do not find the prophets, or other men of learning in the Old Testament, affecting any title beside that which denoted their office; and they were contented to be addressed by their bare names. But as religion and true knowledge declined among them, their pride discovered itself in affectation of titles of honour. Thus, in the first ages of the Christian church, during the prevalence of truth, and of piety and humility, the ministers of Christ had no other titles, but the mere names of their office, apostles, pastors, &c., whereas, in the later corrupt ages of ignorance and pride, a number of titles of honour were invented, to support their dignity, and conciliate the respect and reverence of the people; as masters, doctors, &c.

The first Jewish rabbi, said to have been distinguished with any title of honour, was Simeon, the son of Hillel, who succeeded his father as president of the Sanhedrim; and his title

was that of Rabban.* He is supposed by Altingius to have been the Simeon who took the infant Jesus in his arms, and blessed him, Luke ii. 25; and for this reason, as he conceives, he is seldom mentioned by the later rabbies, though he was a man of such honour and dignity, and the first who was distinguished by their favourite title.† Others think it hardly probable, that the Simeon who was directed by the Holy Ghost to pay that respect to our Saviour, was the president of the Sanhedrim; for Gamaliel, the president's son, was tutor to St. Paul, who received no favourable notion of Christianity from him, as in all probability he must have done from the son of that Simeon who took our Saviour in his arms and blessed him. Besides, had he, who did this, been president of the great council, St. Luke in all likelihood would have taken notice of so extraordinary a circumstance, instead of mentioning him only as "a certain man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon."‡

The later rabbies tell us, this title was conferred with a good deal of ceremony. When a person had gone through the schools, and was thought worthy of the degree of rabbi, he was first placed in a chair somewhat raised above the company; then were delivered to him a key and a table-book: the key, as a symbol of the power or authority now conferred upon him, to teach that knowledge to others, which he had learned himself; and this key he afterward wore as a badge of his honour, and when he died, it was buried with him: the table-book was a symbol of his diligence in his studies, and of his endeavouring to make farther improvements in learning.

The third ceremony in the creation of a rabbi was the imposition of hands on him by the delegates of the Sanhedrim, practised in imitation of Moses's§ ordaining Joshua by this rite, to succeed him in his office: Numb. xxvii. 18; Deut. xxxiv. 9. And then,

* Lightfoot's Harmony on Luke ii. 25.

† Alting. de Schilo, lib. iv. xxi. tom. v. Oper. p. 99; Lightfoot, ubi supra; and Horæ Hebr. Luke ii. 25.

‡ See Witsii Miscell. tom. i. lib. i. cap. xxi. sect. xiii.—xvi. p. 289—292, edit. Traject. 1692.

§ Maimon. Tractat. Sanhedrin, cap. iv.; vid. Selden de Synedr. lib. i. cap. xiv. Opera, vol. i. tom. ii. p. 1088, 1089.

Fourthly, they proclaimed his title.*

According to Maimonides, the third ceremony was not looked upon to be essential; but was sometimes omitted. They did not always, saith he, lay their hands on the head of the elder to be ordained; but called him rabbi, and said, Behold thou art ordained, and hast power, &c.†

We find this title given to John the Baptist, John iii. 26; and frequently to our blessed Saviour; as by John's disciples, John i. 38, by Nicodemus, chap. iii. 2, and by the people that followed him; chap. vi. 25.

It has been made a question, whether our Lord had taken the degree and title of rabbi in the Jewish schools. Vitringa maintains the affirmative,‡ alleging that he was called so by Judas, Matt. xxvi. 25, who he supposes would not have complimented him with a title, to which he had no right. It may be replied, that this being before Judas discovered his treason, and while he associated with the disciples, he no doubt affected to speak as respectfully to Christ, as any of the rest.

Vitringa insists upon another argument, to prove that Christ must have taken the degree of rabbi; alleging, that otherwise he could not have preached publicly in the temple, and in the synagogues, as we know he did. But this is built on a mistake in fact. Any Israelite might preach publicly in the temple, or in the synagogue, by the permission of the ruler of it, as we observed in a former lecture.§

Mr. Selden takes the other side of the question,‖ denying that Christ had ever taken this degree. And for this opinion several arguments may be alleged.

1st. It appears that he had had no education in the rabbinical schools, as those who were honoured with this degree must have had; John vii. 15.

2dly. He expresses his disapprobation of the title, and charges his disciples not to assume it, Matt. xxiii. 7, 8: "Be

* See, on the creation of a rabbi, Alting. in Oratione de Promot. Hebr.

† Maimon. Sanhedr. cap. iv.; see Selden, ubi supra, and Lightfoot's Hor. Hebr. Acts xiii. 3.

‡ Vitring. de Synag. Vetere, vol. ii. lib. iii. part i. cap. vii. p. 706, 707.

§ See above, p. 273.

‖ Selden, de Synedr. Hebræor. lib. ii. cap. vii. sect. viii. Opera, vol. i. tom. ii. p. 1373.

not ye called rabbi," &c. Which, as Mr. Selden shows, was a prohibition of their taking that degree; but was not intended absolutely to condemn the use of the title as a mark of civility to those public teachers who might not in form have taken the degree; a practice, at that time, common among the Jews, as giving the title of doctor to the minister of the parish, whether he hath taken the degree or not, is now among us.*

The reason of our Lord's forbidding his disciples to be called, or to affect the title of rabbi, was, doubtless,

1st. To caution them against that pride and haughtiness which generally went along with it. For, though the rabbies pretended to slight the honour, and it was a maxim with them, "Love the work and not the title;"† it is certain, nevertheless, they were excessively proud and vain of it, insomuch that they were highly offended, if any person spoke to them without giving it to them; a remarkable instance of which Wagenseil relates:‡ "A certain rabbi sent a letter to another, and forgot to give him his title; but only called him in plain terms, friend. At which he was so highly incensed, that he immediately sent a messenger to that rabbi, charging him to call him Anan, Anan (which was his name), without giving him the title rabbi." This, it seems, was the keenest revenge he could take on him for so gross an affront. And Dr. Lightfoot tells us, from one of their rabbinical books, that the Sanhedrim excommunicated certain persons twenty-four times for not giving due honour to the rabbies.§

2dly. The design of our Saviour's forbidding his disciples to be called rabbi was probably also, that they might not take upon them to lord it over the faith and consciences of men, as the rabbies did, who pretended to little less than to be infallible guides of faith and conscience; insomuch that it was looked upon as a crime for any person not to hearken to the rabbies, or to disbelieve or doubt of the truth of what they

* Selden. de Synedr. lib. ii. cap. vii. sect. x. Opera, vol. i. tom. ii. p. 1378—1383.

† See Maimonides as quoted by Lightfoot, Hor. Hebraic. Matt. xxiii. 7; and Pyrkè Abhoth, lib. i. cap. x.; et Ob. de Bartenora in loc.

‡ Wagenseil in Sota, annot. v. in cap. i. sect. x. except. Gemaræ, p. 109.

§ Horæ Hebraic. Matt. xxiii. 7.

taught. Hence Gamaliel advises the ignorant among the Jews "to get themselves rabbies, that they may no longer doubt of any thing;"* and Rabbi Eleazar says, "he that separates from the school of the rabbies, or teaches any thing which he has not heard from his master, provokes the Divine Majesty to depart from Israel."†

Maimonides tells us, that men of the degree of rabbi were also called Abba, or father; and that "he who will be holy, must perform the words of the fathers."‡ Hence our Saviour forbids his disciples taking the title of father as well as rabbi; Matt. xxiii. 8, 9.

These are the teachers and guides to whom the apostle seems to refer, when he saith, Rom. ii. 17—20, "Behold thou art called a Jew, and restest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law; and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law."§

The reason of our Saviour's prohibiting his disciples to be called rabbi is expressed in these words, "Be not ye called rabbi, for one is your master, even Christ," καθηγητης, your guide and conductor, on whose word and instructions alone you are to depend in matters of religion and salvation. Accordingly the inspired apostles pretend to nothing more than, as the ambassadors of Christ, to deliver his instructions; and for their own part, they expressly disclaim all dominion over the faith and consciences of men; see 2 Cor. v. 20; chap i. 24.

The Jewish writers distinguish between the titles Rab, Rabbi, and Rabban. As for Rab and Rabbi, the only difference between them is, that Rab was the title of such as had had their education, and taken their degree, in some foreign Jewish school; suppose at Babylon, where there was a school

* Pirke Abhoth, cap. i. sect. xvi. which precept Maimonides and Bartenora (in loc.) restrain to ritual observances.

† Talmud Babylon. tit. Berachoth, fol. xxii. ii.; see Lightfoot, Horæ Hebr. Matt. xxiii. 7.

‡ Maimon. in Præfat. Tractat.; Pirke Abhoth, Mishn. tom. iv. p. 393.

§ See Whitby on Matt. xxiii. 8, 9.

or academy of considerable note; Rabbi was the title of such as were educated in the land of Judea, who were accounted more honourable than the others.* But as for Rabban, it was the highest title; which, they say, was never conferred on more than seven persons, namely, on R. Simeon, five of his descendants, and on R. Jochanan, who was of a different family.† It was on this account, it should seem, that the blind man gave this title to Christ, Mark x. 51; being convinced that he was possessed of divine power, and worthy of the most honourable distinctions. And Mary Magdalene, when she saw Christ after his resurrection, "said unto him, Rabboni," John xx. 16, that is, my Rabban, like my lord in English; for rabbon is the same with rabban, only pronounced according to the Syriac dialect.

* Elias Levita in Tishbi, voce רב.

† See Lightfoot's Harmony on Luke ii. 25.

CHAPTER VIII.

OF THE NAZARITES AND RECHABITES.

GODWIN makes a three-fold distinction of Nazarites, which we shall find to be merely a *distinctio nominis*, as the logicians express themselves, and not a *divisio generis* in species.

The first sort, called Nazarites, from נזר *nazar, separavit*, are mentioned several times in the Old and New Testament; the second, whose name is derived from the city Nazareth, are occasionally mentioned in the New; for the third, who rejected the five books of Moses, and were therefore termed Nazarites, according to Godwin, from נשר *nasar, dissecuit*, because they cut off or excluded these books from the canon of Scripture; finding no mention of them either in the Old Testament, or in the New, I think they deserve no farther notice: it is chiefly the first sort that we are now to consider.

The first person to whom the title נזיר *nazir* is applied is Joseph, who, in the forty-ninth chapter of Genesis, is said to be נזיר אחיו *nezir echaiv*, which we render "separated from his brethren," Gen. xlix. 26; but the Vulgate, "Nazaræi inter fratres suos." Moses gives him the same title, in the blessing which he pronounced on his posterity in the Book of Deuteronomy: "Let the blessing come upon the head of Joseph, and upon the top of the head of him that was separated from his brethren," Deut. xxxiii. 16; נזיר אחיו *nezir echaiv*. He is called נזיר *nazir*, not because he was of any particular sect, or such a Nazarite as those concerning whom we are discoursing; but for one or other of the following reasons: either because he was separated from the society of his brethren by their malice toward him; or from their evil practices and examples, by the grace of God; or was advanced by Providence so high above them in dignity and honour. The

Septuagint espouses the last-mentioned reason, reading נזיר אחיו *nezir echaiv*, in Genesis, επι κορυφης ων ηγησατο αδελφων, *super caput fratrum, quorum dux fuit;* and in Deuteronomy, επι κορυφης δοζασθεις επ' αδελφοις, *super verticem glorificatus in fratribus.* Hence the word נזר *nezer* is sometimes used for a royal or sacerdotal crown or diadem: "Thou hast profaned his (the king's) crown, נזר *nezer*, by casting it to the ground;" Psalm lxxxix. 23. Again, "They made the plate of the holy crown (of the high-priest) of pure gold;" Exod. xxxix. 30.

But whatever was the reason of Joseph's being called נזר *nazir*, the word came afterward to denote a particular sort of separation and devotedness to God; and on that account was applied to the Nazarites, who were accordingly of two sorts—such as were by their parents devoted to God in their infancy, or even sometimes before they were born, and such as devoted themselves. The former are called *Nazaræi nativi*, and were Nazarites for life; the latter *Nazaræi votivi*, who ordinarily bound themselves to observe the laws of the Nazarites only for a limited time.

In the number of the *Nazaræi nativi*, or perpetual Nazarites, were Samson, Judges xiii. 5; Samuel, 1 Sam. i. 11; and John the Baptist, Luke i. 15. All that we can discover in their way of life, which was peculiar, was, that they were to abstain from wine and intoxicating liquors, and were not to shave their heads, but let their hair grow to its full length. It is true, neither Samuel nor John the Baptist are expressly called Nazarites, as Samson is. Nevertheless, as one law of the Nazarites is mentioned to which Samuel was obliged, namely, that no razor should come upon his head; and another to which the Baptist was obliged, that he should drink neither wine nor strong drink; it is reasonably presumed they were both under obligation to observe all the laws of the perpetual Nazarites.

The rabbies insist that Absalom was a perpetual Nazarite, because he wore his hair so long, that when he polled it, it weighed two hundred shekels; 2 Sam. xiv. 26. But as this circumstance is mentioned immediately after the account of the beauty of his person, ver. 25, it leads one to conclude, that he wore his hair so long, rather for ornament, than on

any religious account. Besides, his polling it at the end of the year is an evidence against his being a perpetual Nazarite. The rabbies, indeed, have framed a rule for the perpetual Nazarites, on purpose not to exclude Absalom; affirming, that when their hair grew very heavy and troublesome, they were allowed to cut it to the length in which it was ordinarily worn by other people, but not to shave it quite off; and this, they say, was the reason of Absalom's polling his head every year, because his hair grew so exceeding heavy, that what he cut off, weighed "two hundred shekels, after the king's weight."*

We shall not stay to dispute this point with the rabbies, because it is of no great consequence. But the amazing weight of Absalom's hair demands our particular attention. Dr. Cumberland, in his Essay on Jewish Weights and Measures, shows, that a Jewish shekel of silver was equal to half an ounce avoirdupoise. Consequently, two hundred shekels is six pounds and a quarter; an incredible weight for the hair of one man's head!

Various are the conjectures of the learned in order to remove this difficulty. Some suppose the shekel here spoken of was less than the common shekel; and they observe his hair is said to weigh "two hundred shekels after the king's weight," not according to the common shekel of the sanctuary. Now, should we suppose the shekel here meant to be a weight in gold equal to the value of the silver shekel, or half ounce, that would reduce the weight of the hair to about five ounces.

Others imagine there has been an error in transcribing the Hebrew copy; that the number of shekels being expressed by the numeral letter כ *caph*, which stands for twenty, the transcriber mistook it for ר *resh*, which stands for two hundred; a mistake which might easily be made if the lower part of the caph was not very plain.

Others again are of opinion, that the two hundred shekels denote, not the weight but the value of the hair; the Jewish women having been used to purchase it to adorn themselves.

* Vid. R. de Bartenor.; et Maimon. Comment. in Mishn. tit. Nazir, cap. i. sect. ii. tom. iii. p. 148, edit. Surenhus.

It cannot, indeed, be easily supposed, that the king's son sold his hair. But the verb שקל *shakal*, rendered "he weighed," may be taken impersonally,* to signify, it was weighed at the rate of two hundred shekels, perhaps by the barber, whose perquisite it might be.

Where we cannot arrive at certainty, we must be content with probability; and, I apprehend, either of these conjectures is sufficiently probable to relieve the difficulty in the text.

We return to the Nazarites: I have only farther to observe concerning the *Nazaræi nativi*, that they were not bound to the same strictness as the *votivi*, who must not touch any dead carcass, nor so much as enter the doors of a house where a deceased person was. Samson, who was a *Nazaræus nativus*, made no scruple of taking honey out of the carcass of a lion, Judges xiv. 8, 9; and Samuel hewed Agag in pieces; 1 Sam. xv. 33.

As for the *Nazaræi votivi*, who bound themselves by a vow to observe the law of the Nazarites for a certain time, suppose a month (the rabbies say it could not be for a less time, though it might be for a longer),† their laws, which are contained in the sixth chapter of the Book of Numbers, are these:—

1st. That they should abstain from wine, and from all inebriating liquors, and even from eating grapes, during the time of their separation; Numb. vi. 3, 4.

2dly. That they should let their hair grow without cutting it till the days of their vow were fulfilled, ver. 5; and then they were to have their hair shaved off at the door of the tabernacle, and burnt under the altar; ver. 18. It was probably from this custom of the Jewish Nazarites, that the Gentiles learnt the practice of consecrating their hair to their gods,‡ of which Suetonius relates an instance in his life of Nero; informing us, that he cut off his first beard, and put it

* See many instances of this sort produced by Glassius, Philolog. Sacra, lib. iii. tract. iii. de Verbo, canon xxiii. p. 380, 381, edit. Amstel. 1711.

† Mish. tit. Nazir, cap. i. sect. iii. p. 148, tom. iii. edit. Surenhus.

‡ Lucian represents this as a very common custom, with which he himself had complied, de Syriâ Dea, sub fin.

into a golden box set with jewels, and consecrated it to Jupiter Capitolinus.*

When a *Nazaræus votivus* was polluted by touching any dead body, he was to "shave his head on the seventh day," that is, at the end of the time during which he was unclean, and "on the eighth day to offer a sin-offering and a burnt-offering for his purification;" and then to "consecrate unto the Lord the days of his separation," bringing a "lamb of the first year for a trespass-offering:" that is, he was to begin again the accomplishment of his vow, "the days which were before having been lost, because his separation was defiled;" Numb. vi. 9—12. The Nazarite's shaving his head in case of pollution is not ordered to be done, as in case of the accomplishment of his vow, at the temple; but might be done any where, it seems, in the country, provided it was not so far distant as to prevent his offering the accustomed sacrifices at the temple the next day. However, some learned men have thought, that those who were at a great distance, or in foreign countries, might have their head shaved in the place where they were, and offer the appointed sacrifice at the temple the next opportunity, whether on account of accidental pollution, or at the accomplishment of their vow.† Thus they say Paul (according to others, Aquila‡) did, Acts xviii. 18, who made his vow at Corinth, shaved his head at Cenchrea, and went soon afterward to Jerusalem to accomplish it by the usual offering.§

3dly. A Nazarite must not come near any dead body, while the vow was upon him; Numb. vi. 6.

It is to be observed, that women, as well as men, might

* Sueton. in Vit. Neronis, cap. xii. 11, p. 176, 177, tom. ii. edit. Pitisci, Traject. ad Rhen. 1690.

† Steph. Morin. dissert. viii. p. 103; Grotius, on Acts xviii. 18; Ancient Universal History, in the History of the Jews, book i. chap. vii.

‡ Witsii Meletem. de Vitâ Pauli, sect. vii. xiii. p. 100, et xv. ad fin. p. 102; Grotius in loc.

§ Concerning St. Paul's vow, see Doddridge in loc.; Lardner's Credib. vol. i. book i. chap. ix. sect. vii.; Benson's History of Planting the Christian Religion, vol. ii. chap. v. sect. xiii. and chap. viii. sect. xi.; Hammond in loc.; Wolfii Curæ Philolog. in loc.; and Meinhard de Pauli Naziræatu, apud Thesaur. Philolog. Theolog. tom. ii. p. 473, especially cap. iv., Amstel. 1702.

bind themselves by this vow: "When either man or woman shall separate themselves to vow a vow of a Nazarite," then they shall do so and so; Numb. vi. 2. This the mother of Samson is advised by the angel to do, at least to submit to the rule of the Nazarites during the time of her gestation; Judges xiii. 7.

The institution of Nazaritism was no doubt partly religious, and it might also be partly civil and prudential.

That it was partly religious is concluded from the following passage of the prophet Amos, in which, among other extraordinary favours and blessings which God had vouchsafed to the Israelites, he tells them, "I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazarites," chap. ii. 11; that is, I inspired them with a more than ordinary spirit of devotion and piety, and induced them to take the Nazarite's vow, by which they were bound to the strictest sanctity, to give themselves to reading, meditation, and prayer: and, in token of their moral purity, carefully to avoid all legal pollution, and, in sign of their spiritual mortification, and as having their minds so taken up with divine contemplation as to be negligent of external ornaments, they were to let their hair grow without trimming. Moreover, they were to abstain from wine and all inebriating liquors during the days of their separation; just as the priests were forbidden to drink wine during their attendance on their ministry, "lest they forget the law," and their minds should be discomposed for the exercises of devotion.

The interdiction laid on the Nazarites was more strict and severe than that laid upon the priests. The former were forbidden the total use of the vine, they might neither taste "any liquor made of grapes, whether wine or vinegar, nor eat moist grapes, nor dried, neither any thing that came of the vine-tree, from the kernel even to the husk;" Numb. vi. 3, 4. Which occasions Dr. Lightfoot's making the two following queries:—

1st. Whether the vine-tree might not be the tree in Paradise, which was forbidden to Adam, and, by tasting the fruit of which, he sinned and fell. The Jewish doctors, he saith, positively asserted this, without the least hesitation.

2dly. Whether the law about the Nazarites had not some

reference to Adam, while under that prohibition in his state of innocence? If the bodily and legal uncleanness, concerning which there are precepts so very strict in the thirteenth chapter of Leviticus; if the leprosy especially, the greatest of all uncleannesses, properly betokened the state and nature of sin; might not the laws concerning Nazarites, which enjoined the strictest purity in the most pure religion, insomuch that Nazarites are said to be "purer than snow, and whiter than milk," Lam. iv. 7, be designed in commemoration of the state of innocence before the fall?*

But beside the religious, there might also be a civil and prudential use of this institution, the sobriety and temperance which the Nazarites were bound to observe being very conducive to health. Accordingly they are celebrated for their fair and ruddy complexion, being said to be both whiter than milk, and more ruddy in body than rubies, Lam. iv. 7; the sure signs of a sound and healthy constitution. It may here be observed, that when God intended to raise up Samson by his strength of body to scourge the enemies of Israel, he ordered, that from his infancy he should drink no wine, but live by the rule of the Nazarites, because that would greatly contribute to make him strong and healthy; intending, after nature had done its utmost to form this extraordinary instrument of his providence, to supply its defect by his own supernatural power.†

Godwin mentions a second sort of Nazarites, who were so termed from נצר *natsar*, from whence came Natzareth or Nazareth, the name of a town in Galilee, where Christ was conceived and brought up. Hence our Saviour was himself called a Nazarene, or Nazarite, Matt. ii. 23; for this name or title, as applied to Christ, is sometimes wrote Ναζαρηνος, Mark xiv. 67; xvi. 6; Luke iv. 34; sometimes Ναζοραιος, Matt. xxvi. 71; John xviii. 7, 8; Acts ii. 22; which words seem to be

* Lightfoot, Horæ Hebr. in Luc. i. 15.

† Concerning the Nazarites, see Ainsworth on Numb. vi.; Relandi Antiq. Hebræor. part ii. cap. x.; Leusden. Philolog. Hebræo-Mixt. dissert. xxii.; Spanheim. Dubia Evang. p. ii. dub. xciii. xciv.; Meinhard de Naziræatu Pauli, ubi supra; and Sigonius de Republ. Hebræor. lib. v. cap. viii. cum notis Nicolai, Lugd. Bat. 1701.

used by the evangelists in precisely the same sense; accordingly the Syriac version renders both by the word *notzrio*.

The evangelist Matthew, assigning as the reason for our Saviour's being called Ναζαραιος, that he came and dwelt in the city of Nazareth, Matt. ii. 23, and referring to some prophecy, which, at least in express words, is no where to be found in all the Old Testament, hath given the critics and commentators no little trouble: "that it might be fulfilled," saith he, "which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene." Some, indeed, suppose the reference is to what is said of Samson,* whom they take to be a type of Christ, "The child shall be a Nazarite unto God," Judges xiii. 5; and this, they say, was accomplished in his antitype. Others† conceive the prophecy is to be found in Isaiah, where Christ is termed נצר *netzer*, "the branch," chap. xi. 1. Witsius thinks he discovers it in the book of Job, chap. vii. 20, and in several other places, where God is called נוצר *notzer*, the "preserver of men."‡ However, there is one very material objection against all these solutions, that they give no account how this was fulfilled by Christ's being at Nazareth. Either, therefore, we must acquiesce in the opinion of Chrysostom,§ that the passage here referred to is lost;‖ or, in that more probable one of Jerome, that the evangelist does not here refer to any one particular passage, but to what several of the prophets had in effect said. For in that he uses the word prophets in the plural number, it is evident, saith that father, he did not take the words from the Scripture, but the sense only.¶ Now, being called a Nazarene is the same thing as being one, the Hebrews expressing word and thing by the same term. The name of God in many places signifies God himself. "His name shall be called," means, he

* Kidder on the Messiah, part ii. p. 67, 68, second edit. fol. 1726.

† See Hammond on Matt. ii. 23; and Deylingius, in his Observationes Sacræ, part i. observ. xl. sect. iii. p. 177, 178, Lipsiæ, 1720.

‡ Meletem. diss. ii. sect. xvi. xvii. p. 285—287.

§ Homil. in Matt. ix.

‖ So Mr. Whiston supposes; see his Sermons at Boyle's Lecture, on the Accomplishment of Prophecies, p. 54, Cambridge, 1708.

¶ See the passage quoted by Whitby on Matt. ii. 23.

shall be "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace;" Isa. ix. 6. "My house shall be called," signifies, my house shall be "the house of prayer:" chap. lvi. 7; Mark xi. 17. The meaning, then, of Christ's being called Ναζαραιος may be, that he shall be despised and reproached, according to a variety of predictions, Psalm xxii. 6; lxix. 9; Isa. liii. 3—5; Zech. xi. 12, 13; which were accomplished, in one instance at least, by his being called a Nazarite, from his having dwelt at Nazareth, that being a town of such ill repute, that it was commonly thought no good could come out of it, John i. 46; and our Saviour's being supposed to come out of it being one occasion of his being despised and rejected by the Jews, chap. vii. 52.

Nevertheless, the appellation Ναζαραιος, of Nazareth, coming to be added to Jesus, to distinguish him from all others of the same name, we find it sometimes applied to him when no reproach was intended, as by St. Peter, Acts ii. 22; iii. 6; iv. 10; and by an angel, Mark xvi. 6. It is, however, generally used by the Jews as a term of reproach, not only in respect to our Saviour himself, but to his disciples after his ascension. They styled them, "the sect of the Nazarenes;" Acts xxiv. 5. Nevertheless, the disciples of Christ, after they had generally taken the name of Christians, turned the tables upon the Jews, giving this title of reproach to the Judaizing Christians; as we learn from Epiphanius; who says, the Nazarenes were the same with the Jews in every thing relating to the doctrine and ceremonies of the Old Testament, only differing from them in this, that they professed to believe, that Jesus Christ was the Messiah.* These were the heretics Godwin speaks of under the name of Nazarites. But the history and dogmata of this sect belong rather to Christian, than to Jewish antiquities.†

As to the Rechabites, though they dwelt among the Israelites, they did not belong to any of their tribes; for they were Kenites, as appears from the second chapter of the First Book

* Epiphan. Adversus Hæreses, hær. xxix. sect. vii. apud Oper. tom. i. p. 122, edit. Petav. Colon. 1682.

† See, on this title of Christ, Spanheim. Dubia Evangel. part ii. dub. xc. xci. xciii.; Witsii Meletem. dissert. ii.; and the commentators on Matt. ii. 23.

of Chronicles, where the Kenites are said to have come of "Hemath, the father of the house of Rechab;" ver. 55. These Kenites, afterward styled Rechabites, were of the family of Jethro, otherwise called Hobab, whose daughter Moses married; for "the children of the Kenite, Moses's father-in-law," it is said, "went up out of the city of palm-trees with the children of Judah, and dwelt among the people," Judges i. 16; and we read of "Heber the Kenite, who was of the children of Hobab, the father-in-law of Moses, who had severed himself from the Kenites," or from the bulk of them who settled in the tribe of Judah, "and pitched his tent in the plain of Zaanaim;" chap. iv. 11. They appear to have sprung from Midian, the son of Abraham by Keturah, Gen. xxv. 2; for Jethro, from whom they are descended, is called a Midianite; Numb. x. 29. This Jethro was invited by Moses, his son-in-law, to leave his country, and settle with his family among the Israelites. At first he refused, ver. 30; but afterward, being importuned, ver. 31, 32, it seems he consented; since we find his posterity settled among the Israelites, with whom they continued till their latest ages. Balaam, therefore, celebrates their prudence and happiness, in putting themselves under the protection of God's favourite nation, though he foretells, that they should be fellow-sufferers in the captivity; Numb. xxiv. 21, 22. Of this family was Jehonadab, the son of Rechab, a man of eminent zeal for the pure worship of God against idolatry, who assisted king Jehu in destroying the house of Ahab, and the worshippers of Baal; 2 Kings x. 15, 16. 23, &c. It was he who gave that rule of life to his children and posterity, which we read of in the thirty-fifth chapter of Jeremiah, ver. 6, 7. It consisted of these three articles:—

1st. That they should drink no wine.

2dly. That they should neither possess nor occupy any houses, fields, or vineyards.

3dly. That they should dwell in tents.

In these regulations he seems to have had no religious, but merely a prudential view, as is intimated in the reason assigned for them, ver, 7, "that you may live many days in the land where you are strangers." And this would be the natural consequence of observing these rules, inasmuch,

1st. As their temperate way of living would very much contribute to preserve their health: and as,

2dly. They would hereby avoid giving umbrage to, and exciting the envy of the Jews, who might have been provoked, by their engaging and succeeding in the principal business in which they themselves were employed, namely, tillage and vine-dressing, to expel them their country; by which they would have been deprived of the religious advantages they then enjoyed. That they might, therefore, be under no temptation to plant and cultivate vineyards, he forbade them the use of wine.

Should it be inquired how they maintained themselves, it may be answered, they are, in the First Book of Chronicles, called Scribes, chap. ii. 55, which intimates, that they were engaged in some sort of literary employments.

I suppose the reason of Godwin's treating of the Nazarites and Rechabites in the same chapter is, that neither of them drank wine; for in no other respect were they alike, the former being a religious, and the latter merely a prudential and civil institution.*

* Vid. Witsii Dissert. de Rechabitis, prefixed to his Latin translation of Godwin's Moses and Aaron, inserted into Hottinger's edition, and printed likewise in Witsii Miscellan. tom. ii.

CHAPTER IX.

OF THE ASSIDEANS.

After the spirit of prophecy ceased, and there were no inspired persons to whom the Jews could apply to decide their religious doubts and disputes, different opinions soon sprang up among them, and divided them into various sects and parties; the chief of which were the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes, all supposed to arise from the Assideans, who are entitled, therefore, to our first attention.

The Hebrew word חסידים *chasidim*, is used in several places of Scripture appellatively, for good and pious men, Psalm cxlix. 1; cxlv. 10; Isa. lvii. 1; Mic. vii. 2; but never, I apprehend, for a religious sect. In the apocryphal book of the Maccabees, indeed, we often meet with the ασιδαιοι, a word plainly derived from the Hebrew חסידים *chasidim;* as in the following passage: "There came to Mattathias a company of Assideans, who were mighty men of Israel, even all such as were voluntarily devoted unto the law," 1 Macc. ii. 42; see also chap. vii. 13, and 2 Macc. xiv. 16. These Assideans, spoken of in the Maccabees, have generally been supposed to be some sect subsisting at that time. Yet as Josephus wrote of the same times and of the same affairs, without mentioning any such sect, some have doubted, and not without reason, whether there ever was any such, and whether the word ασιδαιοι be not used in the Maccabees, as חסידים *chasidim* is in the Hebrew Bible, for pious persons in general, even such as "were voluntarily devoted unto the law." And it is no improbable conjecture, that as they were persons generally of that character, who, in defence of their law and religion, first adhered to Mattathias, and afterward to his son Judas Maccabæus, the name ασιδαιοι, or saints, was by their enemies converted into a term of reproach and scorn, as the word puritans was in the last century, and saints very often is now.

And as I see no sufficient evidence of the *ασιδαιοι*, in the time of the Maccabees, being a distinct sect from other pious Jews, I lay no stress upon Godwin's distinction between the צדיקים *tsadikim* and the חסידים *chasidim*, which, he saith, took place after the captivity, and consisted in the following particulars: the *tsadikim* gave themselves to the study of the Scripture; the *chasidim* studied how to add to the Scripture; the former would conform to whatever the law required; the latter would be holy above the law; thus to the repairing of the temple, the maintaining of sacrifices, the relief of the poor, &c., they would voluntarily add over and above, to that which the law required.

Neither do I think it probable, as Godwin supposes, that this apostle refers to any such distinction when he saith, "Scarcely for a righteous man, *δικαιου*, would one die; yet peradventure for a good man, *αγαθου*, some would even dare to die;" Rom. v. 7, 8. By the *αγαθος*, or good man, the apostle rather meant a kind, benevolent, charitable man, than such as were for adding to the divine law, and performing works of supererogation. In this sense the word *αγαθος* is continually used in the New Testament. For instance, in the Gospel of St. Matthew we meet with this expression, "Is thine eye evil because I am good?" or beneficent, *αγαθος*, Matt. xx. 15. In the Epistle to the Romans, "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good," *αγαθω*, with kind and generous actions; chap. xii. 21. In the Epistle to Philemon, *το αγαθον* means "thy kindness," ver. 14; and in the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, *αγαθος οφθαλμος* signifies "the liberal eye;" chap. xxxv. 8. The meaning and design of the apostle, therefore, in the passage before us, may be thus represented: So engaging are the charms of generosity and benevolence above mere righteousness and justice, that though scarcely any man will hazard his life for one who has nothing but the latter to recommend him, several might be found, who would run this important risk to prevent the death or destruction of a disinterested and generous friend. But the love of Christ (for it is to illustrate that love the apostle makes this observation) appears to be far more free, generous, and exalted, than any instance of

human friendship, in that when we were yet sinners, and possessed, therefore, of none of these good or amiable qualities to recommend us, he laid down his life for us.*

The צדיקים *tsadikim,* Godwin imagines, were the same with the קראים *karraim,* or Karraites. It is certain the Karraites were anciently a considerable sect, which is still in being in Poland and Russia, but chiefly in Turkey and Egypt.

They have their name from the Chaldee word קרא *kara, scriptura sacra,* because they adhered to the Scriptures as the whole and only rule of their faith and practice; which occasioned their being called קראים *karraim, textuales,* or *scriptuarii,* while those who adhered to the traditions taught by the rabbies were called רבנים *rabbanim, rabbinistæ.*

These party names were first given them about thirty years before Christ, when, upon the dissension between Hillel, the president of the Sanhedrim, and Shammai, the vice-president, by which their respective scholars were listed into two parties, between whom there were perpetual contests, those that were of the opinion of the Karraites sided with the school of Shammai, and those who were zealous for traditions, with the school of Hillel. Nevertheless, though the name קראים *karraim* be thus modern, the sect boasts of their high antiquity; for they say they are the followers of Moses and the prophets, as they undoubtedly are on account of their adhering to the Scriptures, in opposition to human traditions. Yet Dr. Prideaux says they did not reject all traditions absolutely, only refused them the same authority as they allowed to the written word. As human helps, conducive to their better understanding the Scriptures, they were content to admit them, but not to put them on a foot with the written oracles of God, as all the other Jews did.†

The Karraites differ also from the rest of the Jews in this, that they read the Scriptures, as well as their liturgies, every where, both in public and private, in the language of the

* Concerning the Assideans, consult Drusius de Hasidæis, and De Tribus Sectis Judæorum, lib. iv. cap. x.—xiii.; and also his Quæst. Hebr. lib. i. quæst. xlvii.; Scaliger's Elenchos Trihæreseôs Judæorum, cap. xxii.; Fuller's Miscell. Sacra, lib. i. cap. viii., and Prideaux's Connect. part ii. book v. sub anno 107, vol. iii. p. 256, 257, 10th edit.

† Prideaux's Connect. part ii. book v. sub anno 107, vol. iii. p. 476.

country in which they dwell: at Constantinople, in modern Greek; in Caffa, in Turkish, &c.*

As the school of Hillel prevailed against that of Shammai, the Rabbinists became the popular sect, and the Karraites were looked upon as schismatics and heretics, being loaded with much reproach by the other Jews; though in reality, of all their sects, they were the purest and most pious. They are frequently branded with the name Sadducees by the Jewish rabbies, by whom, I suppose, Godwin was led into the mistake which he commits, when he represents them as rejecting not only traditions, but all Scripture, except the five books of Moses. The truth is, all the Sadducees agreed with the Karraites in rejecting traditions, but the Karraites by no means agreed with the Sadducees in rejecting the greater part of the Scriptures.

As the Rabbinists interpret the Scriptures by the traditions which the Karraites reject, it is no wonder they differ in the sense of many texts, and practise the rites of worship in a different manner. Reland reckons up six articles of difference between the Karraites and other Jews:—

1st. The Rabbinists reckon the feast of the new moon, and the beginning of the month, by astronomical calculations; the Karraites begin the month with the first appearance of the moon after the change.

2dly. The Rabbinists killed the paschal lamb in the afternoon, when the sun was declining; the Karraites not till after the sun was set.

3dly. The Rabbinists admitted the whole family to eat the passover; the Karraites, none but the males, and of them only such as were of age.

4thly. The Rabbinists held, that what remained of the passover, was to be burnt on the sixteenth day of the month, or, if that proved the Sabbath, on the seventeenth; the Karraites, that it was always to be burnt on the fifteenth; see Exod. xii. 10.

5thly. They differed about the meaning of the law concerning the offering of the sheaf of the first-fruits; Lev. xxiii. 10, 11. The Rabbinists offered it the day after the passover; the

* Hottingeri Thesaur. Philolog. inter Addenda, p. 583, edit. Tigur. 1649.

Karraites thought it was to be offered the day after the Sabbath next to the passover.

6thly. In the feast of tabernacles, the Rabbinists carry about branches and a citron, in a sort of procession; the Karraites allow of no such ceremony.*

It may not be improper to observe, that the Mohammedans are distinguished into two sects, in some measure analogous to the Rabbinists and Karraites among the Jews; namely, the Sonnites and the Shiites. The Sonnites are so called, because they acknowledge the authority of the Sonna, or collection of traditions concerning the sayings and actions of their prophet, which is a kind of supplement to the Koran, directing the observance of several things there omitted, and in name, as well as design, answering to the Mishna of the Jews.

The Shiites, which name properly signifies sectaries, or adherents in general, but is peculiarly applied to the sect of Ali, reject the Sonna as apocryphal and fabulous. These acknowledge Ali, the son-in-law of Mohammed, for his true and lawful successor, and even prefer him to Mohammed himself. The Turks are Sonnites; the Persians Shiites. These two Mohammedan sects have as great an antipathy to one another as any two sects, either of Jews or Christians. So greatly is Spinoza mistaken, in preferring the order of the Mohammedan church to that of the Roman, because no schisms have arisen in the former since its birth.†

* Vid. Relandi Antiquitat. Hebræor. part ii. cap. ix. sect. xii.; see also, on the subject of the Karraites, Trigland. de Sectâ Karæorum; Father Simon's Histoire Critique Vieux Testament, liv. i. ch. xxix., or the Latin edition, p. 145; and also his Disquisitiones Criticæ, cap. xii.; R. Mardochæus Karæus, apud Wolfii Notitiam Karæorum; Basnage, Hist. of the Jews, book ii. chap. viii. ix.

† Vid. Spinoz. Opera Posthuma, p. 613; and Sale's Preliminary Discourse to his Translation of the Koran, sect. viii. p. 175. 178, London, 1734.

CHAPTER X.

OF THE PHARISEES.

The Pharisees derived their name, not, as some have supposed, from פרש *pharash, exposuit*, because they were in the highest reputation for expounding the law; for it appears by the rabbies there were women Pharisees, to whom that office did not appertain: but either, as Godwin apprehends, from פרש *pirresh*, in the conjugation *pihel;* or from פרס *pharas, devisit, partitus est*, which is sometimes written with a ש *sin;* see Mic. iii. 3; Lam. iv. 4. פרושים *pherushim*, in the Hebrew dialect, or פרישין *pherishin*, or פרישיא *pherishe*, according to the Chaldee, signifies persons who were separated from others; which name, therefore, was assumed by the Pharisees, not because they held separate assemblies for divine worship, but because they pretended to a more than ordinary sanctity and strictness in religion. Thus in the Acts of the Apostles the Pharisees are said to be *ακριβεστατη αιρεσις*, the most exact sect of the Jewish religion, chap. xxvi. 5; agreeable to the account Josephus gives, that this sect was thought *ευσεβεστερον ειναι των αλλων*, to be more pious and devout than others, and to interpret the law with greater accuracy.* In another place he saith, they valued themselves in their exactness on the law, and on their skill in the interpretation of it; and seemed to excel all others in the knowledge and observation of the customs of their fathers.†

It is very uncertain when this sect first sprung up; but there is no doubt its date, as well as that of all other religious sects among the Jews, ought to be fixed later than the death of Malachi, when the spirit of prophecy ceased from Israel.

* Joseph. de Bello Judaic. lib. i. cap. v. sect. ii. p. 63, Haverc.; see also lib. ii. cap. viii. sect. xiv. p. 166.

† Antiq. lib. xvii. cap. ii. sect. iv. p. 830; et in Vitâ suâ, sect. xxxviii. p. 18.

We read, indeed, of persons much of the same spirit and temper with the Pharisees in Isaiah, who said, "Stand by thyself, come not near me; for I am holier than thou;" chap. lxv. 5. But this only shows there were proud hypocrites before the sect of the Pharisees arose.

I know not upon what authority Godwin makes Antigonus Socheus to be the founder of this sect, three hundred years before Christ. Dr. Lightfoot thinks, that Pharisaism rose up gradually, and was long before it came to the maturity of a sect; but when that was, he does not pretend to determine.* It appears by Josephus, that in the time of John Hyrcanus, the high-priest, and prince of the Asmonean line, about a hundred and eight years before Christ, the sect was not only formed, but made a considerable figure: insomuch, that this prince thought it for his interest to endeavour to ingratiate himself with the Pharisees, and gain them to his party. For this end he invited the heads of them to an entertainment, and, having regaled them, paid them the compliment to desire, that if they saw any thing in his administration unacceptable to God, or unjust or injurious to men, they would admonish him of it, and give him their advice and instructions, how it might be reformed and amended. Whereupon one Eleazar, a sour Pharisee, told him, "that if he would approve himself a just man, he must quit the priesthood, and content himself with the civil government. Upon that he was highly provoked, and went over to the Sadducees.† To what a height of popularity and power this sect was grown about eighty years before Christ, appears from another passage in Josephus.‡ When king Alexander Jannæus lay on his death-bed, and his wife Alexandra was exceedingly troubled at the ill state in which she found she and her children would be left on account of the hatred which she knew the Pharisees bore to her husband and his family, he advised her by all means to caress the Pharisees, since that would be the way to secure her the affection of the bulk of the nation; for there were no such friends where they loved, and no such enemies where they hated; and whether they spoke true or false, good or

* Horæ Hebr. in Matt. iii. 7.

† Joseph. Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. x. sect. v. vi. p. 662, 663.

‡ Ubi supra, cap. xv. sect. v.; et cap. xvi. sect. i. p. 675, 676.

evil of any person, they would be alike believed by the common people. With this view he enjoined her, after his death, to commit his body to their disposal; and at the same time to assure them, that she would ever resign herself to their authority and direction. Do this, said he, and you will not only gain me an honourable funeral, but yourself and your children a secure settlement in the government. And so it accordingly happened; his funeral was more sumptuous than any of his predecessors, and his queen was firmly established in the supreme administration of the nation.

According to Basnage, one Aristobulus, an Alexandrian Jew, and a peripatetic philosopher, who flourished about one hundred and twenty-five years before Christ, and wrote some commentaries on the Scripture in the allegorical way, was the author of those traditions, by an adherence to which chiefly the Pharisees were distinguished from other Jewish sects.* But it is by no means probable such a heap of traditions should spring up at once, but rather gradually; and so, according to Lightfoot,† did the sect of the Pharisees itself, till at length it became the most considerable of all.

Their distinguishing dogmata may be all, in a manner, referred to their holding the traditions of the elders, which they not only set upon an equal footing with the written law, but in many cases explained the former by the latter, quite contrary to its true intent and meaning. And thus "they made the commandment of God of none effect by their traditions;" Matt. xv. 6. They pretended to derive these from the same fountain with the written word itself; for they say, that when Moses waited upon God forty days in the mount, he received from him a double law; one in writing, the other traditionary, containing the sense and explication of the former—that Moses, being come to his tent, repeated it first to Aaron, then to Ithamar and Eleazar his sons, then to the seventy elders, and lastly to all the people. The rabbies farther inform us, that Moses at his death repeated the oral law again to Joshua; that he delivered it to the elders, they to the prophets, and the prophets to the wise men of the great synagogue; and so

* Basnage's History of the Jews, book ii. chap. ix. sect. ii. p. 110, London, 1708.

† Lightfoot, Horæ Hebr. Matt. iii. 7, sect. iii.

it was handed through several generations, till at length R. Judah Haccodhesh, reflecting on the unsettled condition of his nation, after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish polity, and how apt these traditionary precepts would be to be forgotten in their dispersion and oppression, committed them to writing about 150 years after Christ,* and called his book the Mishna, or the second law, of which we have formerly given an account.

The dogmata of the Pharisees may be distinguished into doctrinal and practical.

The distinguishing doctrines maintained by this sect, were concerning predestination and free-will, angels and spirits, and the future state and resurrection.

1st. As to predestination and free-will, they went a middle way between the Sadducees, who denied the pre-determination of human actions and events, and the Essenes, who ascribed all things to fate and to the stars. Whereas the Pharisees, according to Josephus, ascribed some things to fate, but held that other things were left in a man's own power, so that he might do them or not :† or rather, according to another account he gives,‡ they held, that all things were decreed of God, yet not so as to take away the freedom of man's will in acting.

2dly. The Pharisees held the doctrine of angels and separate human spirits, which the Sadducees denied ; Acts xxiii. 8.

3dly. As to the future state and resurrection, the Pharisees differed both from the Sadducees and Essenes. For, whereas the former held that both soul and body utterly perished at death, and had no existence after it ; and the latter, that the soul would continue to exist after death, but without any future union with the body ; the Pharisees maintained the resurrection of the bodies, at least of good men, and the future and eternal state of retribution to all men ; Acts xxiii. 8. Josephus, who was himself a Pharisee, gives this account of their doctrine in these points, "*Ψυχην δε πασαν μεν αφθαρτον, μεταβαινειν δε εις ἑτερον σωμα, την των αγαθων μονην, την δε των*

* See p. 274, note*.

† Joseph. Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. v. sect. ix. p. 649.

‡ De Bello Judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. sect. xiv. p. 166; Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. i. sect. iii. p. 871.

φαυλων αιδιω τιμωρια χολαζεσθαι: Every soul is immortal, those of the good only enter into another body, but those of the bad are tormented with everlasting punishment.* From whence it has been pretty generally concluded, that the resurrection they held was only a Pythagorean one, namely, the transmigration of the soul into another body; from which they excluded all that were notoriously wicked, who were doomed at once to eternal punishment; but their opinion was, that those who were guilty only of lesser crimes were punished for them in the bodies into which their souls were next sent.

It is supposed, that it was upon this notion the disciples asked our Lord, "Did this man sin, or his parents, that he was born blind?" John ix. 2; and that some said, Matt. xvi. 14, Christ was "John the Baptist, some Elias, others Jeremias, or one of the prophets."†

This was undoubtedly the opinion of the Pythagoreans,‡ and Platonists,§ and was embraced by some among the Jews; as by the author of the Book of Wisdom, who says, "that being good, he came into a body undefiled;" chap. viii. 20. Nevertheless, it is questioned by some persons, whether the words of Josephus, before quoted, are a sufficient evidence of this doctrine of the metempsychosis being received by the whole sect of the Pharisees; for μεταβαινειν εις ἑτερον σωμα, passing into another or different body, may only denote its receiving a body at the resurrection; which will be another, not in substance, but in quality; as it is said of Christ at his transfiguration, το ειδος του προσωπου αυτου ἑτερον, "the fashion of his countenance was" another, or, as we render it, was "altered;" Luke ix. 29.

As to the opinion which some entertained concerning our Saviour, that he was either John the Baptist, or Elias, or Jeremias, or one of the prophets, Matt. xvi. 14, it is not

* De Bell. Judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. sect. xiv. p. 166.

† See Prideaux's Connect. part. ii. book v. sub anno 107 before Christ, vol. iii. p. 479, 480, tenth edit. London, 1729.

‡ Diogen. Laert. de Vitis Philosoph. lib. viii. de Vitâ Pythag. segm. xiv. et not. Aldobrandini in loc. vol. i. p. 499, edit. Amstel. 1692.

§ Plato in Phædro, p. 1223, B, C, D, E, edit. Ficin. Francof. 1602; et Diogen. Laert. de Vitis Philos. lib. iii. de Vitâ Platonis, segm. lxvii. vol. i. p. 204, 205.

ascribed to the Pharisees in particular; and if it were, I do not see how it could be founded on the doctrine of the metempsychosis; since the soul of Elias, now inhabiting the body of Jesus, would no more make him to be Elias, than several others had been, in whose bodies the soul of Elias, according to this doctrine, is supposed to have dwelt since the death of that ancient prophet, near a thousand years before. Besides, how was it possible any person that saw Christ, who did not appear to be less than thirty years old, should, according to the notion of the metempsychosis, conceit him to be John the Baptist, who had been so lately beheaded? Surely this apprehension must be grounded on the supposition of a proper resurrection. It was probably, therefore, upon the same account, that others took him to be Elias, and others Jeremias. Accordingly, St. Luke expresses it thus: "Others say, that one of the old prophets is risen from the dead;" Luke ix. 19.

It may farther be observed, that the doctrine of the resurrection, which St. Paul preached, was not a present metempsychosis, but a real future resurrection, which he calls "the hope and resurrection of the dead;" Acts xxiii. 6. This he professed as a Pharisee, and for this profession the partisans of that sect vindicated him against the Sadducees; ver. 7—9. Upon the whole, therefore, it appears most reasonable to adopt the opinion of Reland, though in opposition to the sentiments of many other learned men, that the Pharisees held the doctrine of the resurrection in a proper sense.*

Thus far their doctrinal opinions appear to have been agreeable to the Scripture, excepting that one grand principle, that the traditions of the fathers came from God, and were at least upon an equal foot with the sacred writings. This was the root, the πρωτον ψευδος, of various errors; from hence proceeded most of the corrupt practical dogmata of this sect: Which we are now,

2dly. To consider. Hence, they gave so erroneous an in-

* Reland. Antiq. Hebr. part ii. cap. ix. sect. xiv. p. 278, third edit. Traject. Bat. 1717. Concerning the improbability of the Pharisees having held the doctrine of the metempsychosis in our Saviour's time, see Buddei Historia Eccles. Vet. Testament. tom. ii. per. ii. p. 1203.

terpretation of many texts of Scripture, explaining them according to their traditions; which was the occasion of their transgressing the commandments of God, and making them of none effect; Matt. xv. 3—6.

Hence they fell into many very superstitious practices, in which they placed a great part of their religion; such as frequent washing their hands and their household furniture, beyond what the law required, Mark vii. 3, 4; fasting twice a week, Luke xviii. 12; and, if we may credit the Talmud, practising many painful austerities and mortifications, whipping themselves, lying upon flints and thorns, and knocking their heads against walls till they made them bleed.*

Hence being busied about trifles, and taken up with a multitude of rites and ceremonies, they forgot and neglected the great duties of morality. Thus, while they were superstitiously exact "in tithing mint, anise, and cummin, they overlooked the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith," Matt. xxiii. 23; and by thus placing their religion in things wherein true religion does not consist, they in a manner lost all notion of spiritual piety and godliness, and became the most finished hypocrites among the Jews. Pharisees and hypocrites are often joined together in the gospel history, and several instances of their hypocrisy mentioned, namely, their fasting, almsgiving, and making long prayers in the synagogues, and even in corners of the streets, on purpose "to be seen of men," and to gain their applause; and "for a pretence, the better to cover their secret wickedness:" Matt. vi. 2. 5. 16; xxiii. 5—7. 14. In short, they placed the whole of religion in outward ceremonial observances, and therefore took no pains or care to get their hearts purified: they freely indulged their pride and malice, and all other sorts of spiritual wickedness: on which account they are compared by our Saviour to whited sepulchres, Matt. xxiii. 27; and because they were very exact in their ritual observances, in which they abounded beyond others, they looked upon themselves to be more religious, and

* Mish. tit. Sotah, cap. iii. sect. iv. sub fin. cum not. Bartenor et Wagenseil. Sotah, excerpt. Gemar. cap. iii. sect. xi.; Drusius de Tribus Sectis, lib. ii. cap. xiv. p. 71, first edit. p. 253, edit. Trigland; Buxtorf. Synag. Judaic. cap. xxv. p. 521—523, third edit. Basil, 1661. See Epiphanius, hær. xvi. sect. i. tom. i. p. 33, 34, edit. Petav.

the peculiar favourites of Heaven, and therefore "they trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others," Luke xviii. 9; and their pride being thus fed, they affected pre-eminence, and expected a greater share of respect than others; Matt. xxiii. 6, 7. From the same criminal principle they "made broad their phylacteries, and enlarged the borders of their garments;" ver. 5.

The phylacteries, called by the Jews תפלין *tephillin*, are little scrolls of parchment, in which are written certain sentences of the law, enclosed in leather cases, and bound with thongs on the forehead and on the left arm. They are called in Greek *φυλακτηρια*, from *φυλαττω*, *custodio*, either because they were supposed to preserve the law in memory, or rather, because they were looked upon as a kind of amulets or charms to keep them from danger. Godwin gives an account from the rabbies of the sentences of the law written in the phylacteries, and the manner of writing and folding them up, which is sufficiently exact.* I shall only observe, that the making and wearing these phylacteries, as the Jews still do in their private devotions, is owing to a misinterpretation of those texts,† on which they ground the practice, namely, God's commanding them "to bind the law for a sign on their hands, and to let it be as frontlets between their eyes," &c., Deut. vi. 8. This precept evidently refers to the whole law of Moses, and not to the particular sentences which they wrote in their phylacteries; see ver. 6. The command of writing and binding this law as a sign upon the hands, and as frontlets between the eyes, ought doubtless to be understood metaphorically, as a charge to remember it, to meditate upon it, to have it as it were continually before their eyes, and to conduct their lives by it; as when Solomon says, concerning the commandments of God in general, "bind them about thy neck, write them upon the table of thy heart:" Prov. iii. 1. 3; vi. 21. The precept, therefore, which we are now considering, to "bind the words of the law for a sign upon the hands, and as front-

* See Maimon. Tephillin, seu de Phylacteriis, Wagenseil, Sotah, excerpt. Gemar. cap. ii. sect. ii. not. x. p. 397—418, Altdorf. 1674; and Surenhusii Tabulæ de Phylacteriis, prefixed to the first volume of his edition of the Mishna.

† See Le Clerc on Exod. xiii. 9.

lets between the eyes," Deut. vi. 8, is to be explained by the sentence which precedes it, "These words, which I commanded thee this day, shall be in thine heart." In like manner it is said elsewhere, "Ye shall lay up my words in your hearts and in your souls;" chap. xi. 18. However, the Jews understanding the foregoing precept, not metaphorically, but literally, wrote out the several passages wherever it occurs, and to which it seems to refer, and bound them upon their foreheads and upon their arms.

It seems the Pharisees used to "make broad" their phylacteries. This some understand of the knots of the thongs by which they were fastened, which were tied very artificially in the form of Hebrew letters; and that the pride of the Pharisees induced them to have these knots larger than ordinary, as a peculiar ornament. Others supposed they affected to wear the phylacteries themselves very large, as if they contained more of the law than was commonly worn by their neighbours, and were therefore a testimony of their extraordinary affection for it. It is imagined by some persons, that the phylacteries are alluded to in the book of the Revelation, chap. xiii. 16, where the subjects of antichrist are said to be distinguished by "a mark on their right hands and on their foreheads."*

The Pharisees are farther said to "enlarge the borders of their garments," *τα κρασπεδα των ιματιων*, see Matt. xxiii. 5, before cited. These *κρασπεδα* were the ציצית *tsitsith*, the fringes which the Jews are, in the book of Numbers, commanded to wear upon the borders of their garments, Numb. xv. 38, 39. The Targum of Onkelos calls them כרוספדין *cheruspedhin*, which hath so near an affinity with the Greek word *κρασπεδον*, that there is no doubt but it signifies the same thing; which is, therefore, an evidence, that the *κρασπεδα* were the ציצית *tsitsith*. These were worn by our Saviour, as appears from the following passage of St. Matthew: "Behold, a woman, which was diseased with an issue of blood

* See a large account of the superstition of the Jews concerning the phylacteries, in Ainsworth on Exod. xiii. 9; Buxtorf's Synag. Judaicâ, cap. ix. and Lexic. Talmud. in voc. תפלה. Consult, also, on this subject, Spenceri Dissert. de Nat. et Orig. Phylact. ad Calcem. tom. ii. de Legibus, edit. Cantab. 1727.

twelve years, came behind him, and touched the hem of his garment," κρασπεδον του ἱματιου, Matt. ix. 20. Again, the inhabitants of Gennesaret are said to have brought unto him their diseased, and to have "besought him, that they might only touch the hem of his garment," κρασπεδον του ἱματιου, Matt. xiv. 36. Κρασπεδον του ἱματιου is, in both these passages, very improperly translated the "hem of his garment." It should have been rendered the fringe; and it should seem the people imagined there was some peculiar virtue or sanctity in the fringe of our Saviour's garment above any other part, from their expectation of a miraculous cure by touching it. It appears, indeed, the later Jews placed a great deal of sanctity in these fringes. Rabbi Menachem, on the fifteenth chapter of Numbers, saith, when any man is clothed with a fringe, and goeth out therewith to the door of his habitation, he is safe, and God rejoiceth, and the destroying angel departeth from thence, and that man shall be delivered from all hurt, and from all destruction.*

Concerning the form of this fringe, we can only frame an uncertain guess from the two Hebrew words by which it is expressed, namely, ציצית *tsitsith*, Numb. xv. 38, 39, and גדלים *gedhilim*, Deut. xxii. 12; which is likewise rendered by the Chaldee Paraphrast כרוספדין *cheruspedhin*. The former, *tsitsith*, is used for a lock of hair, Ezek. viii. 3; the latter for a rope, such as Dalilah bound Samson with; Judges xvi. 11, 12. From hence it is inferred, that these fringes consisted of many threads, which hung like hair, and were twisted like a rope. It was also ordered by the law, that they should put upon the fringe a riband of blue, or a thread, as the word פתיל *pathil* seems to be properly rendered in a passage of the book of Judges, where it is said concerning Samson, that he "broke the withs," with which he was bound, "as a thread, פתיל *pethil*, of tow is broken when it toucheth the fire," chap. xvi. 9; or else it may signify lace, as it is rendered in a passage of the book of Exodus, chap. xxxix. 31, where the string, which fastened the holy crown to the high-priest's mitre, is expressed by the same word used for this blue thread, or lace, upon the fringe of their garments. Whether, therefore, it was a blue thread twisted with a white

* R. Menachem on Numb. xv., quoted by Ainsworth on Numb. xv. 39

through the whole fringe; whether it was a blue lace, by which the fringe was fastened to the edge of the garment; or whether it was sewed along the head of the fringe,—is what we cannot take upon us to determine.

The use of this fringe is said to be, "that they might look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the Lord, and do them;" Numb. xv. 39. Some conceive the fringe was to be a distinguishing badge, which God ordered the people of Israel to wear on their clothes, in the nature of a livery, that they might be known for his servants, who was not ashamed to own them for his peculiar people; as he had before, for the same purpose, ordered them to wear a distinguishing mark in their flesh, namely, circumcision. This account well agrees with the reason given for their wearing the fringe, "that they might look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the Lord, to do them;" that is, that it might remind them, that as the servants of Jehovah, whose livery they wore, they were bound to do all that he had commanded them. And as by this badge they were to be distinguished from the servants of all other gods, so it was to be a guard upon them from idolatry; accordingly it follows, "that ye seek not after your own hearts, and your own eyes, after which ye used to go a whoring."

Le Clerc* indeed suggests, that the Jews borrowed this fashion of wearing fringes from the Egyptians, because Herodotus, speaking of the Egyptians, says, ενδεδυκασι κιθωνας λινεους περι τα σκελεα θυσσανωτους, *induli sunt tunicis lineis circa crura fimbratis*.† But why might it not as well be supposed, the Egyptians learnt it from the Jews, as the Jews from the Egyptians?

After all, there are some, Calvin in particular,‡ who suppose these fringes to be nothing but strings, with tassels, at the four corners of their upper garment, which was made of a square piece of cloth, in the same fashion that was afterward worn by the Greeks and Romans.

* Clerici Annot. in Num. xv. 38.

† Herodot. Euterp. cap. lxxxi. p. 118, edit. Gronov. Lugd. Bat. 1716.

‡ Calvini Comment. in Deut. xxii. 12, Oper. tom. i. p. 522, Amstel. 1671.

This opinion very well agrees with the precept in Deuteronomy, "Thou shalt make thee fringes upon the four quarters," wings, as the margin renders it, or rather corners, "of thy vesture, wherewith thou coverest thyself;" chap. xxii. 12. And the proper use of these strings was to tie the corners together. Such strings the modern Jews have to their veils, and each string has five knots in it, besides the tassel, signifying the five books of the law. The rabbies observe, that each string consists of eight threads, which, added to five, the number of knots, and likewise to the numeral value of the letters in the word ציצית *tsitsith*, amounts to six hundred and thirteen, the number, according to them, of the precepts of the law. From hence they infer the importance of the command concerning the ציצית *tsitsith;* he who observes it, they say, in effect observing the whole law.*

The Pharisees are censured by our Saviour for enlarging these fringes of their garments, which we may suppose they did partly from pride and partly from hypocrisy, as pretending thereby an extraordinary regard for the law. It is reported by Jerome, as quoted by Godwin, that they used to have fringes extravagantly long, sticking thorns in them, that, by pricking their legs as they walked, they might put them in mind of the law.†

From the same corrupt fountain whence we have derived the other superstitions and corruptions of the Pharisees, even their attachment to the traditions, we may also trace their most unreasonable and malicious opposition to our Saviour. For, having learnt to interpret the prophecies of the Messiah in a carnal sense, and being strongly tinctured with the notion of his being designed to be a temporal prince and deliverer, no miracles could overcome their prejudices against the meanness of Christ's appearance, and persuade them that a person

* Buxtorf. Synag. Jud. cap. ix. p. 164, edit. 3, Basil. 1661; et Lex. Talmud. in voc. ציצית.

† Concerning the fringes, see Ainsworth on Numb. xv. 38, 39, Deut. xxii. 12; Buxtorfii Synag. Judaic. cap. ix. p. 160—170; et Lexic. Talmud. in voc. ציצית; Drusius de Sectis Judæor. lib. ii. cap. xvi. p. 267, edit. Trigland; et Leusden. Philolog. Hebræo-Mixt. dissert. xvii. p. 118, 119, edit. 2, Ultraject. 1682.

who made no pretence to civil authority and military power, could possibly be "Messiah the prince," the "son of David, and the Saviour of Israel." They got him, therefore, apprehended, condemned, and executed, as an impostor.*

* See an account of the Pharisees in Drusius de Tribus Sectis Judæorum, lib. ii. cap. xii. ult.; in Lightfoot, Horæ Hebr. Matt. iii. 7; in Basnage's History of the Jews, book ii. chap. x. xi.; in Clerici Ecclesiast. Histor. Prolegom. sect. i. cap. ii. p. 5—12; and in Prideaux's Connect. part. ii. book v. vol. iii. p. 479—483, edit. 10.

CHAPTER XI.

OF THE SADDUCEES AND SAMARITANS.

As for the Sadducees, Epiphanius derives the name from צדק *tsedhek, justitia;** but that derivation neither suits the word Sadducee, nor the true character of the sect. For so far were they from being eminently righteous, that they are commonly said to be the most wicked and profligate of all the Jews; neither were they given to boast of their own righteousness, as the Pharisees were.

Another etymology, which Theophylact mentions together with the former,† is therefore esteemed to be the more probable one, that their name was derived απο αιρεσιαρχου Σαδωκ. This he borrowed from the Talmud, which tells us, that Sadoc was a scholar of Antigonus Sochæus, president of the Sanhedrim about two hundred and sixty years before Christ; who having inculcated upon his scholars, that they ought to serve God out of pure love to him, and not in a servile manner, either for fear of punishment or hope of reward; Sadoc, not understanding this spiritual doctrine, concluded there was no future state of rewards and punishments, and accordingly taught and propagated that error after his master's death.‡ However that be (for I must confess with me talmudical stories have but little credit), this is said to have been the doctrine of the Sadducees. That they denied the resurrection, and that there are angels and spirits, appears from the account given of them in the New Testament: Matt. xxii. 23; Acts xxiii. 8. According to Josephus, they rejected the traditions of the

* Epiphan. adversus Hæres. lib. i. hæres. xiv. p. 31, C. edit. Petav. Colon. 1682.

† Theophylact. Comment. in Matt. iii. 7, p. 18.

‡ Mishn. tit. Pirke Abhoth, cap. i. sect. iii. et Maimon. in loc. See Lightfoot, Horæ Hebraicæ, in Acts xxiii. 8.

Pharisees;* they not only denied the resurrection of the body, but the life and existence of the soul after death: they likewise denied all divine decrees, and held that man was absolutely master of his own actions, with a full freedom to do either good or evil, as he thought proper; that God did not influence him in doing either; and that his prosperity or adversity are placed within his own power, and are respectively the effect of his wisdom or his folly;† a notion which in effect amounts to denying a providence, and to the subversion of all religion; so that they were, upon the whole, Epicurean Deists in all other respects, except that they acknowledged the world to have been created, and perhaps to be upheld and preserved by God. This historian gives them a very bad character as to their morals, and says, "they were a set of men churlish and morose toward each other, and cruel and savage to all besides."‡ However, we must remember, that Josephus himself was a Pharisee, of an opposite sect, and that such persons are very apt, from their mutual aversion, to misrepresent and calumniate each other. Perhaps his account of the Sadducees is not without some tincture of pharisaical misrepresentation; for it can hardly be supposed, that men of such very corrupt principles, as he represents them, should continue uncensured and uncondemned by the Sanhedrim, much less be suffered to fill the highest posts in church and state, as we find they did; it appearing that Caiaphas, the high-priest, who condemned our Saviour, was of this sect; Acts v. 17. Besides, the character given them by this historian is altogether inconsistent with their receiving, which all admit they did, the five books of Moses, even though it were true that they rejected all the other sacred books, which Godwin lays to their charge, but from which Scaliger endeavours to exculpate them.§ Indeed, the silence of Josephus renders this charge upon them justly suspected; for though he often mentions them, and loads them with imputa-

* Joseph. Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. x. sect. vi. p. 663; lib. xviii. cap. i. sect. iv. p. 71, edit. Haverc.

† Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. i. sect. iv. p. 871; De Bello Judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. sect. xiv. p. 166; Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. v. sect. ix. p. 649.

‡ De Bello Judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. sect. xiv. p. 166.

§ Elench. Trihæres, cap. xvi.

tions of many corrupt principles and practices, yet he never speaks of their rejecting any part of the holy Scriptures, which no doubt he would have done, if it had been fact. Nay, he says, that though they rejected the traditions of the fathers, they received *τα γεγραμμενα*, the written books,* an expression too general, and too much in their favour, to have flowed from his pen, if he could with any plausibility have accused them of rejecting any one of them. And even in the Talmud the Sadducees are introduced as disputing and arguing from passages in the prophets, and the Pharisees as answering them from the same books,† which implies, that those books were received by them; nor are they ever accused by any of the ancient rabbies with rejecting them. Some of them, indeed, style them כותיים *chuthiim*, which is another name for the Samaritans. But, perhaps, that was only as a term of reproach, which the Jews bestowed upon those whom they hated, as upon our Saviour, who, they said, was "a Samaritan, and had a devil;" John viii. 48. However, the Samaritans admitting only the five books of Moses to be canonical, hence it hath come to pass, that the Sadducees being by the rabbies sometimes styled כותיים *chuthiim*, or Samaritans, hath been the occasion, without sufficient reason, of the Sadducees being supposed, as well as the Samaritans, to have rejected all the writings of the Old Testament except those of Moses. Scaliger's opinion seems to be more probable, that they did not reject the prophets and the hagiographa, but only expounded them in a different sense from the Pharisees and other Jews.‡

It is a question of some difficulty, how the Sadducees could

* Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. x. sect. vi. p. 663. *Δεγον εκεινα δειν ηγεισθ αι νομικα τα γεγραμμενα, τα δ' εκ παραδοσεως των πατερων μη τηρειν.* The word *νομικα* is here applied to *τα γεγραμμενα*, the whole Scripture, as opposed to tradition; and the word *νομων* seems to be used in the same comprehensive sense, lib. xviii. cap. i. sect. iv. p. 871.

† Cod. Sanhedrin, cap. Chelek, ab init.; Vid. Reland. Antiq. part ii. cap. ix. sect. x. p. 273, edit. 3; Sadducæi testimonium citant contra resurrectionem ex Job vii. 9, in Ilmedenu, fol. ii. col. iv., inquit Drusius, de Tribus Sectis Judæor. lib. iii. cap. ix. in margin. See especially Lightfoot, Horæ Hebraic. John iv. 25.

‡ Scaliger, ubi supra; Drusius de Tribus Sectis Judæor. lib. iii. cap. ix.; et Respons. ad Serar. Minerv. lib. ii. cap. xi.; Reland. Antiq. part ii. cap. ix. sect. x. p. 273.

disbelieve the existence of angels, and yet receive even the five books of Moses as canonical Scripture, wherein are so many narratives of the appearance of angels. Probably their opinion concerning angels was, that they were not permanent beings, but temporary phantoms, formed by the divine power for particular purposes, and dissipated again when these were answered.

In the time of Josephus this sect was not large, but it is said to be the richest, and that those of the greatest quality and opulence generally belonged to it;* which we can easily credit, as we observe in our day, that the great and rich are apt to prefer the pleasure and grandeur of this life to any expectancy in a future; and greedily to embrace such doctrines as tend to encourage their luxury and sensuality, by ridding their minds of uneasy reflections on the judgment-day and world to come.†

Of the Samaritans.

With the Sadducees Godwin joins the Samaritans, with whom he says they have a near affinity; that is, on supposition of their rejecting all the sacred writings but the five books of Moses, which Origen,‡ Jerome,§ and Epiphanius‖ say the Samaritans did.

The Samaritans were originally heathens, consisting of persons of several nations, to whom the king of Assyria gave the cities and lands of the Israelites upon the Assyrian captivity. They were called Samaritans from the city Samaria,

* Joseph. Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. x. sect. vi. p. 663; lib. xviii. cap. i. sect. iv. p. 871.

† See an account of the Sadducees, not only in the authors before cited, but in Le Clerc's Histor. Eccles. Prolegom. sect. i. cap. iii. p. 12—15; Basnage's History of the Jews, book ii. chap. vi. vii.; Bayle's Dictionary, article Sadducees; and Lightfoot, Horæ Hebr. Matt. iii. 7.

‡ Origen. contra Celsum, lib. i. p. 38, edit. Cantab. 1677; Comment. in Johan. apud Comment. in Scripturas, part. posterior. p. 218, edit. Huet. Colon. 1685.

§ Hieron. in Dialogo adversus Luciferianos, as quoted by Prideaux, part i. book vi. anno 409 ante Christum, vol. ii. p. 597.

‖ Epiphan. adversus Hæres. lib. i. hæres. ix. Samarit. sect. ii. tom. i. p. 24, edit. Petav. Colon. 1682.

the metropolis of the kingdom of Israel. When they first settled in the country, they practised only the idolatrous rites of the several nations from whence they came; but upon being infested with lions, which they supposed a judgment upon them for not paying due honour to the ancient god of the country, the king of Assyria sent a Jewish priest to instruct them in the worship of Jehovah; upon which, out of the several customs and modes of worship of the nations to which they belonged, and the rites of the worship of Jehovah, they made up a very motley religion; 2 Kings xvii. 24, *et seq.* Upon the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity, and the rebuilding Jerusalem and the temple, the religion of the Samaritans received another alteration on the following occasion. One of the sons of Jehoiada, the high-priest, whom Josephus calls Manasseh,* married the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite; but the law of God having forbidden the intermarriages of the Israelites with any other nation, Nehemiah set himself to reform this corruption, which had spread into many Jewish families, and obliged all that had taken strange wives immediately to part with them; Nehem. xiii. 23—30. Manasseh, unwilling to quit his wife, fled to Samaria, and many others, who were in the same case with him, being also of the same mind, went and settled under the protection of Sanballat, governor of Samaria. From that time the worship of the Samaritans came much nearer to that of the Jews; and they afterward obtained leave of Alexander the Great to build a temple on mount Gerizim, near the city Samaria, in imitation of the temple at Jerusalem, where they practised the same forms of worship. It is very common for people, who are nearly, but not entirely of the same religion, to have a greater aversion to one another, than those whose sentiments and forms of worship are more different. So it was with the Jews and Samaritans. Hence it was the highest term of reproach among the Jews to call a person a Samaritan, as was before observed; and so great was their mutual animosity, that they would neither ask nor receive any favours from each other. The woman of Samaria, therefore, wondered that Christ, "being a Jew, would ask drink of her who was a Samaritan;" John iv. 9. And when our Lord had occasion to

* Joseph. Antiq. lib. xi. cap. viii. sect. i. ii. p. 578, 579.

pass through Samaria, as he was going to Jerusalem to keep one of the annual feasts at the temple, the Samaritans would give him no entertainment on his journey, not merely because he was a Jew, but because, designing to keep the feast at Jerusalem, he plainly preferred that temple above theirs; Luke ix. 52, 53. As to what Godwin advances, that the Samaritans allowed of no commerce with the Jews, which he grounds on the forecited passage, concerning the surprise of the woman of Samaria, that Christ, being a Jew, asked drink of her, who was a Samaritan; and its being added as the reason of this, "for the Jews have no dealings with *ου συγχρωνται*, the Samaritans, John iv. 9;—I say, the opinion, that the Samaritans permitted no kind of commerce with the Jews, is evidently confuted by our being informed, that while this conversation passed between our Saviour and the woman, "the disciples were gone into the city" of Samaria, "to buy meat;" ver. 8. Nothing can be meant, therefore, by *ου συγχρωνται*, but that they would have no friendly intercourse, nor perform acts of mutual civility.*

* See, concerning the Samaritans, Reland. Dissertat. Miscellan. vol. ii. dissert. vii. de Samaritanis; Prideaux's Connect. part i. book vi. sub anno 409 ante Christum.

CHAPTER XII.

OF THE ESSENES.

The Essenes, though no notice is taken of them, at least by name, in any part of the Scripture history, were yet a considerable sect among the Jews, of whom both Josephus and Philo have given a large account; the former in the twelfth chapter of his second book of the Jewish war, where he professedly treats of the three principal sects of the Jews, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes. He likewise speaks of them occasionally in several other parts of his works. Philo, in his book entitled *Omnis probus Liber*,* gives a very particular account of the dogmata and manners of this sect, nearly, though not quite, the same with that of Josephus. It is very possible there might be some little difference between the Essenes in Egypt and those in Judea; and Philo, who was an Alexandrian Jew, was acquainted only with the former; Josephus, an inhabitant of Judea, only with the latter. Pliny, the natural historian, hath left us some account of the Essenes in the seventeenth chapter of the fifth book of his history.†

These are the only ancient writers who speak of the Essenes, on whose narratives, as they were cotemporary with them, we may depend. As for what Epiphanius, and other ancient and modern authors have said of them, it can only be by conjecture, any farther than they have taken their materials from those above-mentioned.

The etymology of the name has given grammarians and critics no little trouble. Josephus is silent upon it. Philo derives it from οσιος, holy, because of the extraordinary sanctity of the Essenes, though he confesses that derivation is not

* See also Philo de Vitâ Contemplativâ.

† The several accounts are inserted at large in Dr. Prideaux's Connect. part ii. book v. sub fin.

grammatical.* Epiphanius goes the farthest for the etymology of any, deriving the name from Jesse, the father of David.† Salmasius fetches it from a city called Essa, mentioned by Josephus, from whence he imagines this sect first sprung.‡ Serarius hath given us, at least, a dozen different etymologies.§ So various and uncertain are the conjectures of the learned on this subject.

Godwin derives it from the Syriac word אסא *asa*, which signifies to heal or cure, because Philo calls those of the Essenes, who devoted themselves to a contemplative life, θεραπευται, *therapeutæ*, which is naturally derived from θεραπευειν, *sanare;* yet not, as Godwin erroneously says, because they studied physic, according to the common acceptation of that word; but because, saith Philo, they cure men's souls of those diseases which they have contracted by their passions and vices. Or otherwise, as he adds, they have this name, because they have learnt to worship and serve that Being, who is better than good, more uncompounded than the number one, and more ancient than unity itself:‖ for the word θεραπευτης signifies a worshipper, or servant, as well as a physician.¶

These *therapeutæ* are distinguished from those whom Philo calls Practical Essenes, who were employed in the labours of husbandry and other mechanic arts; though only in such as belonged to peace, for none of them would ever put their hands to the making swords or arrows, or any other instruments of war.**

Both Josephus and Philo give a surprising account of their

* Philo in tractat. Omnis probus Liber, Oper. p. 678, C. Colon. Allobr. 1613; vid. Serar. Trihæres. lib. iii. cap. i. p. 109; J. Scaliger. Elench. Trihæres. Serar. cap. xviii. in init.

† Epiphan. Hæres. xix. lib. i. tom. ii. sect iv. p. 120, edit. Petav.

‡ Salmas. Plinian. exercitat. in Solinum, cap. xxxv. p. 432, edit. Ultraject.

§ Serar. Trihæres. Judæor. lib. iii. cap. i. p. 106—110, edit. Trigland. 1703.

‖ Philo de Vitâ Contemplativâ, ab init. Oper. p. 688, B, C; Valesius, in his notes on Eusebius's Eccles. Histor. lib. ii. cap. xvii. p. 66, not. 3, endeavours to prove, against Scaliger, that the Therapeutæ, so largely described by Philo, are not to be reckoned in the number of the Essenes.

¶ Vid. Lexic. Constantin. in verb.

** Philo Tractat. quod Omnis probus Liber, Oper. p. 678, E, D.

austere way of life. Their houses were mean; their clothes made of wool without any dye; they never changed their clothes or shoes, till they were quite worn out: their food was plain and coarse, and their drink water: they neglected all bodily ornaments, and would by no means anoint themselves with oil, according to the fashion of those times. Nay, if any one of them happened to be anointed against his will, he would presently wipe off the oil, and wash himself, as from some pollution. They lived in sodalities, and had all their goods in common; their morals were very exact and pure, and they kept the sabbath more strictly than any of the Jews.*

In the account which Godwin gives of the dogmata of this sect, collected from Josephus and Philo, he asserts, that the Pythagoreans forbad oaths, and so, saith he, did the Essenes.† But this, I apprehend, is a mistake as to the Pythagoreans, and perhaps, also, as to the Essenes. The former, it is well known, used an oath on important occasions, and held it to be most sacred; swearing by the number four, which they wrote by ten dots, in the form of a triangle; so that each side consisted of four dots, thus: Some have imagined Pythagoras took the hint of this from the *Nomen Tetragrammaton* of the Jews;‡ and that, having likewise acquired some notion of the Trinity, he intended to express it by the triangle, which is called his *Trigonon Mysticum.*

As for the Essenes, Josephus saith, that before any are admitted to eat at the common table, they bind themselves by solemn oath to observe the rules of the society.§

Godwin likewise maintains, that the Pythagoreans used

* Philo, ubi supra, p. 678—680; Joseph. de Bello Judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. sect. ii.—xiii. p. 160—165.

† Joseph. de Bell. Jud. ubi supra, sect. vi.; Philo, ubi supra, p. 679, C.

‡ Diog. Laert. in Vitâ Pythag. lib. viii. segm. xxxiii.; Lucian. Dialog. Vitarum Auctio, Oper. tom. iii. p. 103, cum Annot. Cognati, p. 131, edit. Basil.; et Galei Philosoph. General. lib. ii. cap. iii. sect. ii. p. 173. 175.

§ Joseph. de Bell. ubi supra, sect. vii. p. 163. In the former passage, sect. vi., his expression is, *το δε ομνυειν αυτοις περισταται, χειρον τι της επιορχιας υπολαμβανοντες*, though here he saith, *πριν δε της κοινης αψασθαι τροφης, ορκους αυτοις ομνυσι φρικωδεις, κ. τ. λ.* And in sect. viii. he speaks of them as *τοις ορκοις και τοις εθεσι ενδεδεμενοι*, and the like in other places.

only inanimate sacrifices; and so, saith he, did the Essenes; they sent gifts to the temple, but did not sacrifice. But how will this account of the Pythagoreans agree with the story mentioned by Diogenes Laertius and others,* that Pythagoras himself sacrificed a hecatomb, upon his discovering what is called the Pythagoric theorem, namely, that in a right-angled triangle, the square of the hypothenuse is equal to the sum of the squares of the sides? As for the Essenes, it is not easy to reconcile their not using animal sacrifices with the profound veneration which they professed for the five books of Moses, in which so many animal sacrifices are enjoined. Josephus indeed saith, they send their gifts, *αναθηματα*, to the temple, but offer no sacrifices there, by reason of the different rules of purity which they have instituted among themselves. And therefore, being excluded the common temple, they sacrifice apart by themselves; *τας θυσιας επιτελουσι*: the word *θυσιας* imports animal sacrifices that were slain.†

3dly. Godwin saith, the Essenes worship toward the rising sun; and this he grounds on a passage in Josephus; on the authority of which some have charged them with worshipping the sun itself. The words are, *Προς γε μην το Θειον ιδιως ευσεβεις· πριν γαρ ανασχειν τον Ἡλιον, ουδεν θεγγονται των βεβηλων, πατριους δε τινας εις αυτον ευχας, ὡσπερ ικετευοντες ανατειλαι.*‡ If *Ἡλιον*, indeed, be the antecedent to *αυτον*, it must imply that they prayed to the sun itself. But this is not necessarily the construction; for though *το Θειον*, which is of the neuter gender, cannot be the antecedent to *αυτον*,

* Diog. Laert. de Vitis Philosophorum, lib. viii. Vit. Pythagor. segm. xii. p. 497, Amstel. 1692. Cicero represents Cotta as giving no credit to this story, because, as he apprehends, Pythagoras never used animal sacrifices; Cicer. de Natura Deorum, lib. iii. cap. xxxvi. But it is related also by Athenæus, Deipnosoph. lib. x. p. 418, F, edit. Casaub. 1598. See also Plutarch. in Comment. non posse suaviter Vivi secundum Epicur. Oper. tom. ii. p. 1094, B, Francof. 1620.

† Joseph. Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. i. sect. v. p. 871. Yet Dr. Ibbotson (see his note in loc.) renders the word, *εφ' αυτων τας θυσιας επιτελουσι*, very differently from the translation used above, which is that of Dr. Prideaux: his version is, "in seipsis sacrificia peragunt, i. e. sese ipsos Deo vovebant et consecrabant," edit. Haverc.

‡ Joseph. de Bello Judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. sect. v. p. 161, 162.

yet αυτον may very well be supposed to agree with Θεον understood.* Accordingly, Dr. Prideaux translates the words thus, "They are, in whatever pertaineth to God, in an especial manner religious; for before the sun is risen, they speak of no common worldly matter, but till then offer up unto God their prayers in ancient forms, received from their predecessors; supplicating particularly in them, that he would make the sun to rise upon them." If this criticism be not admitted, it is nevertheless much more easy to suppose an error in the copy, αυτον for αυτο, than that the Essenes, who had a more than ordinary zeal for the law of Moses, should be guilty of such gross idolatry as to worship the sun.

There was a notion first started by Eusebius,† and eagerly embraced by many Roman Catholics,‡ that the Therapeutæ were Christian ascetics or monks, converted and instituted by St. Mark: which improbable suggestion Godwin refutes by the following arguments: In Philo's treatise concerning the Therapeutæ, or *de Vitâ Contemplativâ*, there is no mention of Christ or Christians, the evangelists or apostles. Again, the Therapeutæ are not mentioned as a new sect, as the Christians then were; on the contrary, he styles their doctrine "a philosophy derived to them by tradition from their forefathers;" and saith, "they have the commentaries of the ancients, who were the authors of this sect."§ Again, the inscription of Philo's treatise is not only περι βιου θεωρητικου, but also περι ικετων αρετων, and Philo elsewhere calling the whole Jewish nation ικετικον γενος,‖ it may from hence be inferred, that the Therapeutæ were Jews, not Christians.¶ However, it is not impossible, that some of these Jewish Therapeutæ, becoming Christians, might still affect their former

* See Waehneri Antiquitates Ebæor. vol. ii. sect. vii. cap. v. sect. lxii. p. 775, 776, Gottingæ, 1742.

† Euseb. Eccles. Histor. lib. ii. cap. xvii. p. 66, ad fin. capitis.

‡ Seraii Trihæres. lib. iii. cap. xvii.

§ Philo de Vitâ Contemplativâ, Oper. p. 691, C.

‖ Philo de Legation. sect. iii. cap. xvii. ad Caium, ab init.

¶ See this opinion of Eusebius well confuted likewise by Valesius, Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. ii. cap. xvii. p. 68, not. 1. edit. Reading, Cantab. 1720, and by Scaliger in his Elenchus Trihæres. Seraii, cap. xxix.

recluse way of living, and, being imitated by others, might give the first occasion to monkery among Christians.

We have no guide to enable us to discover the origin of this sect. Pliny, indeed, saith, though we know not upon what authority, that it had subsisted for several thousand years.* The most probable opinion is, that it begun a little before the time of the Maccabees, when the faithful Jews were forced to fly from the cruel persecutions of their enemies into deserts and caves; and by living in those retreats, many of them being habituated to retirement, which thereby became most agreeable to them, they chose to continue it, even when they might have appeared upon the public stage again, and accordingly formed themselves into recluses. As to the numbers of which this sect consisted, Philo and Josephus agree, that in Judea there were about four thousand: but in Egypt Philo makes the number of them to be much larger.†

The absolute silence of the evangelical history concerning the Essenes is by some accounted for from their eremetic life, which secluded them from places of public resort; so that they did not come in the way of our Saviour, as the Pharisees and Sadducees often did.

Others are of opinion, that the Essenes, being very honest and sincere, without guile or hypocrisy, gave no room for the reproofs and censures which the other Jews deserved; and therefore no mention is made of them.

But though they are not expressly mentioned in any of the sacred books, it is supposed, and not without reason, that they are referred to by St. Paul, in the second chapter of his Epistle to the Colossians; "Let no man," saith he, "beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility, and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind: which things have indeed a show of wisdom, in will-worship and humility, and neglecting of the body;" chap. ii. 18. 23. What is here said of a voluntary humility, and neglecting the body, is in a peculiar manner applicable to the Essenes; and by Josephus it appears, that they had something peculiar among them re-

* Plin. Histor. Natur. lib. v. cap. xvii.

† Philo in Tractat. quod Omnis probus Liber, Oper. p. 678, C; et de Vitâ Contemplativâ, p. 690, E; Joseph. Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. i. sect. v.

lating to the angels; for he saith, "that when they received any into their number, they made them solemnly swear, that they would keep and observe the books of the sect, and the names of the angels, with care."* What is said of "intruding into things not seen," is likewise agreeable to the character of the therapeutic Essenes, who, placing the excellence of their contemplative life in raising their minds to invisible objects, pretended to such a degree of abstraction and elevation, as to be able to dive into the nature of angels, and assign them proper names, or rightly interpret those already given them; and likewise to pry into futurity, and foretell things to come.† Upon which it is highly probable, "they were vainly puffed up by their fleshly mind." Moreover, the dogmata to which St. Paul refers in the following words, "Touch not, taste not, handle not," ver. 21, are such as the Essenes held, who would not taste any pleasant food, but lived upon coarse bread, and drank nothing but water;‡ and some of them would not taste any food at all till after sun-set;§ and who, if they were touched by any that were not of their own sect, would wash themselves, as after some great pollution.‖ Perhaps there might be a sodality of Essenes at Colosse, as there were in many other places out of Judea; and that some of the Christians, too much inclined to Judaism, might also affect the peculiarities of this sect; which might be the reason of the apostle's so particularly cautioning against them.¶

* Joseph. de Bello Judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. sect. vii. sub. fin. p. 163.

† Joseph. de Bello Judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. sect. xii. p. 165.

‡ Philo de Vitâ Contemplativâ, p. 692, B, p. 696, D.

§ Philo, ubi supra, p. 692, A.

‖ Joseph. ubi supra, sect. x. p. 164.

¶ Concerning the Essenes, besides the references above, see Serarii Trihæresis, Drusius de Tribus Sectis Judæor.; Scaliger's Elenchus Trihæres. Serarii; Clerici Prolegom. ad Histor. Eccles. sect i. cap. iv. v. p. 16—29; and Basnage's History of the Jews, book ii. chap. xii. xiii.

CHAPTER XIII.

OF THE GAULONITES AND HERODIANS.

The Gaulonites were not a religious sect, but a political faction, raised up and headed by Judas of Galilee, who is mentioned in the fifth chapter of the Acts; ver. 37. Josephus calls him Ιουδας Γαυλανιτης in the first chapter of the eighteenth book of his Antiquities;* yet in the title or contents of that chapter, and in the fifth chapter of the twentieth book, he is styled Ιουδας του Γαλιλαιου.† Judas the Gaulonite, therefore, and Judas of Galilee were the same person, indifferently called by one or the other of those names, because Gaulona, his native country, which lay beyond Jordan, was otherwise called Galilee, or Galilee of the Gentiles, Matt. iv. 15, *et alibi*, to distinguish it from the other Galilee on this side Jordan.

This Judas, it seems, had raised and headed an insurrection against the Roman government, on occasion of the tax which Augustus levied on Judea, when he reduced it into the form of a Roman province.‡ This party was soon suppressed, and we read no more of it in the New Testament; unless, perhaps, as Godwin conjectures, those persons were some of this faction, otherwise called Galileans, whom Pilate slew as they were performing the sacred rites at the altar, and thereby mingled their blood with their sacrifices; Luke xiii. 1.

As for the Herodians, they are passed over in silence both by Josephus and Philo, and only known by being mentioned in three passages of the New Testament history. We find them combined with the Pharisees in endeavouring to entangle our Saviour with that ensnaring question, "Whether it was lawful to give tribute to Cæsar;" Matt. xxii. 16, 17. We read of the Pharisees taking counsel with the Herodians against

* Sect. i. p. 869, edit. Haverc. † Sect. ii. p. 965.

‡ Joseph. de Bello Judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. sect. i. p. 160; Antiq. lib. xvii. cap. ult. sect. ult. et lib. xviii. cap. i. sect. i. p. 867. 869, 870.

Jesus, how they might destroy him, Mark iii. 6; and we hear our Lord charging his disciples to take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of Herod; which is commonly understood of the sect of the Herodians, who derived their name from Herod; Mark viii. 15. This account of the Herodians is so concise, that it hath left room for almost numberless conjectures concerning them.

Some make them to be a political party, others a religious sect. The first opinion is favoured by the Syriac version, which every where styles the Herodians, the domestics of Herod; and it is alleged, that the author of this version, as he was nearly cotemporary with them, had the best means of knowing who they were. It is likewise argued, that they could not be a religious sect, because Josephus, who professedly gives an account of the several religious sects of the Jews, neither on that occasion nor on any other makes any mention of the Herodians. On the other hand, in favour of the opinion that they were a religious sect, it is pleaded that our Saviour's cautioning his disciples against the leaven of Herod, implies, that the Herodians were distinguished from the other Jews by some doctrinal tenets, leaven being explained by our Saviour himself to signify doctrine; see Matt. xvi. 6. 12.

It is probable the truth lies between these two opinions, or rather comprehends them both.

The notion, that the Herodians were a set of people who held Herod to be the Messiah, which is espoused by Tertullian,* Epiphanius,† Jerome,‡ Chrysostom,§ and Theophylact,‖ among the ancients, and by Grotius,¶ as well as others, of the moderns, is without sufficient foundation, and highly improbable; whether we understand it to be meant of

* Tertullian. de Præscriptione Hæreticor. cap. xlv. sub fin. Oper. p. 219, B, edit. Rigalt. Paris, 1675.

† Epiphan. adversus Hæreses, hæres. xx. sect. i. p. 45, edit. Petav. Colon. 1682.

‡ Hieron. contra Luciferianos, cap. xvi., though in his Comment on Matt. xxii. 15, 16, he rejects this opinion.

§ Chrysost. in Marc. xii. 13.

‖ Theophylact. in Matt. xxii. 16, p. 131, Paris, 1635.

¶ Grotius de Veritate Christian. Relig. lib. v. sect. xiv. sub fin. in not. et apud annot. in Matt. xvi. 6.

Herod the Great, who died soon after our Saviour was born; or of Herod Antipas, who reigned at the time of his personal ministry; since neither of them were native Israelites, and it cannot well be supposed, that any Jews were so ignorant as to take a foreigner for the Messiah, who had been so expressly promised them to be raised up among themselves, of the tribe of Judah, and of the house of David. Besides, supposing any of them had been so stupid as to apprehend the first Herod to be the Messiah, no doubt his death, to say nothing of his wicked and odious administration, would long since have convinced them of their mistake; since he had been very far from accomplishing the deliverance of Israel from all oppression, which they expected from the Messiah. And as for the second Herod, his dominions were small, and his power little, in comparison with the former; Judea now being reduced into the form of a Roman province; so that he was little more than the procurator of Galilee, with the title only of king. It is therefore utterly inconceivable, that any should take him for the Messiah.

The most probable opinion concerning the Herodians seems to be that of Dr. Prideaux,* that they derived their name from Herod the Great, and were distinguished from the Pharisees and other Jews, by their falling in with Herod's scheme of subjecting himself and his dominions to the Romans, and likewise by complying with many of their heathen usages and customs. In their zeal for the Roman authority they were diametrically opposite to the Pharisees, who esteemed it unlawful to submit, or pay taxes, to the Roman emperor; an opinion which they grounded on their being forbidden by the law to set a stranger over them, who was not one of their own nation, as their king. The conjunction of the Herodians, therefore, with the Pharisees against Christ, is a memorable proof of the keenness of their resentment and malice against him; especially, when we consider that they united together in proposing to him an ensnaring question on a subject which was the ground of their mutual dissension; namely, whether it was lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar; and provided he answered in the negative, the Herodians would accuse him of treason against the state: and should he reply in the affirma-

* Prideaux's Connect. part ii. book v. sub fin.

tive, the Pharisees were as ready to excite the people against him, as an enemy to their civil liberties and privileges.

It is probable the Herodians were distinguished likewise by their compliance with some heathen idolatrous usages which Herod had introduced; who, as Josephus saith, built a temple to Cæsar near the head of the river Jordan,* erected a magnificent theatre at Jerusalem, instituted pagan games,† and placed a golden eagle over the gate of the temple of Jehovah;‡ and, as he elsewhere intimates, furnished the temples which he reared in several places out of Judea, with images for idolatrous worship, in order to ingratiate himself with the emperor and the people of Rome; though to the Jews he pretended, that he did it against his will, and in obedience to the imperial command.§ This symbolizing with idolatry, upon views of interest and worldly policy, was probably the leaven of Herod, which our Saviour cautioned his disciples against.

It is farther probable, that the Herodians were chiefly of the sect of the Sadducees, who sat loosest to religion of all the Jews; since that which is called by St. Mark, chap. viii. ver. 15, the leaven of Herod, is, in the parallel place in St. Matthew, chap. xvi. ver. 6, styled the leaven of the Sadducees.‖

* Antiq. lib. xv. cap. x. sect. iii. p. 776.

† Cap. viii. sect. i. ii. p. 766.

‡ De Bell. Judaic. lib. i. cap. xxxiii. sect. xxiii. p. 139.

§ Antiq. lib. xv. cap. ix. sect. v. p. 772.

‖ See on this subject, Prideaux's Connect. part ii. book v. sub fin.; Basnage's History of the Jews, book ii. chap. xiv.

JEWISH ANTIQUITIES.

BOOK II.

CONCERNING PLACES.

JEWISH ANTIQUITIES.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE TABERNACLE AND TEMPLE.

HAVING, in the last Book, given an account of the most remarkable civil and ecclesiastical persons, officers, and sects among the Jews, we now proceed to the consideration of the most eminent structures, or places, which were esteemed sacred, or held in high veneration amongst them. On this head, Godwin treats first of the tabernacle and temple, though indeed but imperfectly, especially of the former; on the description of whose structure and sumptuous furniture Moses has bestowed almost as many pages as he has lines on his account of the creation of the world; no doubt because the tabernacle was a designed emblem of the blessings of the new creation, which far excelled those of the old; or, as the apostle styles it, was "a figure for the time then present;" Heb. ix. 8, 9.

We have an account of three public tabernacles before the building of Solomon's temple:—

The first, which Moses erected for himself, ונטה-לו *venatah-lo*, Exod. xxxiii. 7; and this the Septuagint calls την σκηνην αυτου. In this tabernacle he gave audience, heard causes, and inquired of God; and perhaps, also, the public offices of religious worship were performed in it for some time, and therefore Moses styled it the tabernacle of the congregation.

The second tabernacle was that which Moses built for God, by his express command, partly to be a palace of his presence as the king of Israel, chap. xl. 34, 35, and partly to be the medium of the most solemn public worship, which the people were to pay to him; ver. 26—29. This tabernacle was erected

on the first day of the first month of the second year of the Israelites' migration out of Egypt; ver. 2. 17.

The third public tabernacle was that which David erected in his own city for the reception of the ark, when he received it from the house of Obededom: 2 Sam. vi. 17; 1 Chron xvi. 1.

It is the second of these tabernacles we are now to treat of, called the tabernacle κατ' εξοχην, by way of distinction and eminence. It was a moveable chapel, so contrived as to be taken to pieces and put together at pleasure, for the convenience of carrying it from place to place, during the wandering of the Israelites in the wilderness for forty years.

The learned Spencer* has fetched this tabernacle, with all its furniture and appurtenances, from Egypt; suggesting, that Moses projected it after the fashion of some such structure, which he had observed in that country, and which was in use among other nations; or at least that God directed it to be made with a view of indulging the Israelites in a compliance with their customs and modes of worship, so far as there was nothing in them directly sinful. And he quotes both sacred and profane writers to prove, that the heathens had such portable temples, in which they deposited the most valuable sacred or religious utensils. Such a temple or tabernacle we read of in the prophecy of Amos: "Ye have borne the tabernacle of Moloch and Chiun, your images, the star of your god, which ye made to yourselves;" chap. v. 26. It is indeed past dispute that the heathens had such tabernacles, as well as many other things, very like those of the Jews; but that they had them before the Jews, and especially that God condescended so far to the humour of the Israelites as to introduce them into his own worship, is neither proved, nor is it probable. It is more likely, that the heathens took these things from the Jews, who had the whole of their religion immediately from God, than that the Jews, or rather that God, should take them from the heathens. Besides, this account of the origin of the Jewish tabernacle and its furniture evidently thwarts the account which the apostle gives of the typical design and use of them, in the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. And farther, supposing those heathen tabernacles to

* De Legibus Hebr. dissert. i.

have been more ancient than that built by Moses by divine direction, yet, so far from there being any design of complying with the idolatrous heathen, the contrary rather appears, in that this tabernacle was ordered to be directly the reverse of theirs, both in its form and situation. In its form: for whereas the heathen tabernacles were carried about whole upon the shoulders of the priests, this was to be taken to pieces whenever it was to be removed. And as to the situation: whereas it was the general practice of the heathens to worship with their faces toward the east, God directed his tabernacle to be so placed, that the people should worship toward the west; for to that point the holy of holies stood, in which were the more special symbols of God's presence, and which the people were to face as they worshipped in the court at the east end of the tabernacle, where was the altar of their sacrifices, as will appear hereafter. This detects a mistake of Godwin's, who makes our cathedral churches answer to the Jewish tabernacle or temple, the sanctuary resembling the body of the church, the sanctum sanctorum the choir, and the court round about the tabernacle the church-yard; it being evident, that the form of these churches, in which the choir or chancel is placed toward the east, is directly contrary to the Jewish tabernacle and temple, and it is borrowed from the heathens, who placed their ναιος to the east, and the προναιος to the west.* That the heathen idolaters worshipped toward the east, appears from the following passage of the prophet Ezekiel: "And he brought me into the inner court of the Lord's house; and behold, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about five and twenty men, with their backs toward the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east, and they worshipped the sun toward the east;" chap. viii. 16. And from Virgil, who, giving an account of Æneas's sacrificing before the battle with Turnus, saith,

> Illi ad surgentem conversi lumina solem,
> Dant fruges manibus salsas, et tempora ferro
> Summa notant pecudum, paterisque altaria libant.
>
> Æneid, xii. l. 172—174.

And accordingly many heathen temples have been converted

* Vid. Vitruv. lib. iv. cap. v.

into Christian churches, without any alteration in the form of the building.

The tabernacle we are now to describe, though otherwise called a tent, because it was a moveable fabric, and because it had no proper roof, but was only covered with curtains or canopies of cloth and skin, was nevertheless built with extraordinary magnificence, and at a prodigious expense, that it might be, in some measure, suitable to the dignity of the King whose palace it was to be, and to the value of those spiritual and eternal blessings, of which it was also designed as a type or emblem. The value of the gold and silver only, used for the work of that holy place, and of which we have an account in the book of Exodus, chap. xxxviii. 24, 25, amounted, according to Bishop Cumberland's reduction of Jewish talents and shekels to English coin, to upward of one hundred eighty-two thousand, five hundred, sixty-eight pounds. If we add to this the vast quantity of brass, or copper, that was also used about this fabric, its court and furniture; the shittim-wood, of which the boards of the tabernacle, as well as the pillars which surrounded the court, and other utensils, were made (which, though we do not know what name the same wood bears now, was no doubt the best and most costly that could be got), as also the rich embroidered curtains and canopies that covered the tabernacle, divided the parts of it, and surrounded the court; and if we farther add the jewels that were set in the high-priest's ephod and breastplate, which are to be considered as a part of the furniture of the tabernacle; the value of the whole materials, exclusive of workmanship, must amount to an immense sum. This sum was raised, partly by voluntary contributions and presents, Exod. xxv. 2, &c., and partly by a poll-tax of half a shekel a head for every male Israelite above twenty years old, chap. xxx. 11—16; which amounted to a hundred talents and one thousand seven hundred seventy-five shekels; that is, thirty-five thousand, three hundred, fifty-nine pounds, seven shillings and sixpence sterling; chap. xxxviii. 25.

We may here remark, that this tax of the half shekel a man was, in after-times, levied yearly for the reparation of the temple, and for defraying the charge of public sacrifices, and other necessaries of divine service. This, as I have before

observed,* was probably the tribute demanded of our Saviour, Matt. xvii. 24; from which, as it was paid to God for the service of his house, and the support of his worship, Christ, as being the Son of God, might, according to the custom of all nations, have pleaded an exemption; ver. 25, 26. However, that he might give no offence, he chose to pay it, though he was obliged to work a miracle to raise so small a sum; ver. 27.

Upon this general view of the prodigious expense of building the tabernacle, it may naturally be inquired, whence had the Israelites, who had not been come a year from their slavery in Egypt, and from labouring at the brick-kilns, riches enough to defray it? To this it may be answered,†

1st. That though the bulk of the people had been reduced to the condition of slaves, yet it may be reasonably supposed that some, especially of the posterity of Joseph, had preserved, and, it may be, concealed their wealth, till they had an opportunity of escaping with it out of Egypt.

2dly. Perhaps the wilderness, where they now were, might supply them with some part of the materials for this building; in particular the wood. Some tell us of a grove of shittim trees near mount Sinai, from whence they had their wood, with no other expense than that of labour.

3dly. Abarbanel conjectures, that the neighbouring nations came and traded with the Israelites in the wilderness, and that God blessed their commerce to the very extraordinary increase of their opulence. But the Scriptures give no account of any strangers resorting to them at this time, besides Jethro and his family; probably the fate of their Egyptian enemies terrified the other neighbouring nations, and made them afraid to come near them.

4thly. The spoil of the Egyptians, who were drowned in the Red Sea, and whose dead bodies were providentially cast upon the shore, where the Israelites were, might very considerably enrich them; Exod. xiv. 30.

5thly. But we are chiefly to account for their riches by their having brought out of Egypt a very large quantity of gold and silver jewels, or vessels, as the word כלי *chelè* sig-

* See p. 57.

† Vid. Witsii Miscell. tom. i. lib. ii. dissert. i. sect. x.

nifies, which were lent, or rather given them, by the Egyptians at their departure. For, by the command of God, chap. iii. 21, they "borrowed," or required, "of the Egyptians jewels," or vessels "of silver, and vessels of gold, and raiment. And the Lord gave them favour in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they lent," or gave, "them such things as they required;" Exod. xii. 35, 36. The verb שאל *shaal*, which in *kal* our translators have rendered "borrow," signifies more properly *petere*, to require or demand; and in *hiphil*, where they have rendered it "to lend," it denotes *mutuum dare*, to give.* This sense of the verb, in both the conjugations, is warranted by the following passage: "The Lord," saith Hannah, in reference to the birth of Samuel, "hath given me my petition which I asked of him, שאלתי *shaalti;* therefore also I have lent, השאלתיהו *hishiltihu*, given, him to the Lord: as long as he liveth he shall be lent, שאול *shaul*, given, to the Lord;" 1 Sam. i. 27, 28. Now some of those vessels which were given to the Israelites, might probably be the silver bowls and chargers, and golden spoons, which were offered by the princes for the service of the tabernacle; Numb. vii. By this means the divine prediction and promise to Abraham was signally accomplished: "The nation whom thy seed shall serve, and who shall afflict them four hundred years, will I judge, and afterwards they shall come out with great substance;" Gen. xv. 13, 14.

Having cleared the ground, and provided the proper funds for building the tabernacle, we come now to erect the edifice, or rather to take a view of it as it was erected by Moses, according to the visionary model shown him in the mount; Exod. xxv. 40.

The tabernacle was an oblong, rectangular figure, thirty cubits long, ten broad, and ten in height; which, reduced to English measure, according to Dr. Cumberland, who supposes it the Egyptian cubit, nearly equal to twenty-two inches,† was fifty-five feet long, eighteen broad, and eighteen high. The two sides and one end were composed of broad boards, standing upright; each board being about two feet nine inches broad, fastened at the bottom by two tenons in each board, fitted into two mortices in the foundation; at the top by links

* Vid. Stockii Clav. in verbum.

† Essay on Jewish Measures, chap. ii. p. 56.

or hasps, and on the sides by five wooden bars, which run through rings or staples in each of the boards. The thickness of these boards is not determined in Scripture. Dr. Lightfoot makes it to be very great;* he supposes about nine inches, because the middle bar is said to shoot "through the boards from one end to the other," Exod. xxxvi. 33; that is, as he conjectures, through a hole in the body of the boards. And no doubt they must be of a very considerable thickness, if they were pierced with a hole big enough to receive a wooden bar, which, considering its length of fifty-five feet, could not be slender. But as boards or timbers of such a length and breadth, and of such a supposed thickness, would be almost unmanageably heavy, may we not rather conceive, that the middle bar, shooting through the boards from end to end, denotes only that it reached the whole length of the tabernacle, whereas the other bars reached but about or little more than half way? For though it is said, "the middle bar in the midst of the boards shall reach from end to end," chap. xxvi. 28, there was no occasion they should all do so.

Each side consisted of twenty of these boards, and the end of eight; which comes to about three feet more than the breadth of the tabernacle. Therefore, if these eight boards stood together in a right line, the end must project considerably on each side of the building. But perhaps the two end boards of the eight stood in an angular position to the sides and the end of the building; for which reason they are distinguished from the other six, and called "the two boards of the corners of the tabernacle;" ver. 23. These boards and these bars were all overlaid with gold; and their rings for the staves, and their hasps at top, were all of the same metal.

The foundation on which they stood was also very costly and magnificent. It consisted of solid blocks of silver, two under each board. They were each about sixteen inches long, and of a suitable breadth and thickness; each weighing a talent, or about an hundred weight. Of these there were about one hundred in number, ninety-six of which were laid for the foundation of the walls of the tabernacle, under the forty-eight boards; and the other four were the bases of the columns that supported the veil or curtain, which divided the

* See his Handful of Gleanings upon Exodus, sect. xxxiv.

inside of the tabernacle into two rooms; Exod. xxxviii. 27. From hence some have derived the ancient fashion of setting porphyry columns on bases of white marble.

The tabernacle, thus fitted and reared, had four different coverings, or curtains, or carpets, thrown one over the other, which hung down on the side, near to the silver foundation.

The first and lowest carpet was made of fine linen, richly embroidered with figures of cherubim, in shades of blue, purple, and scarlet. It is reasonable to suppose, that the right side of this carpet was undermost, and so it formed a beautiful ceiling in the inside of the tabernacle. This carpet consisted of ten breadths, which were joined together with blue loops and clasps of gold.

The next carpet, which lay over the embroidered one, was made of a sort of mohair; the breadths of these were joined together with clasps of brass.

The third carpet was made of rams' skins dyed red; and the uppermost of all, which was to fence the rest from the weather, was made of tachash skins. What beast this was is not certain: it appears that shoe-leather was made of its skin; for God saith concerning Jerusalem, "I clothed thee with broidered work, and shod thee with badger's (*tachash*) skin;" Ezek xvi. 10. It is conceived the Latin word *taxus*, and the German *tachs*, may come from the Hebrew תחש *tachash;* therefore we translate it badger. However, the Jews hold this to be a clean beast, which the badger is not.

Thus we have seen the outside of the tabernacle complete on the top, the two sides, and one end, namely, that which was set toward the west, when the tabernacle was reared; Exod. xxvi. 22. As for the east end, it had no boards, but was sheltered with a fine embroidered curtain, hung upon five pillars of shittim-wood overlaid with gold; ver. 36, 37. The text does not tell us how low this curtain hung. Philo makes it to touch the ground;* but Josephus will have it to come only half way down, that so the people might have a view of the inside of the tabernacle, and of what was done there; but then he says there was another curtain over that, which came down to the ground, and was to preserve it from the weather,

* Philo, Jud. de Vitâ Mosis, lib. iii. p. 516, D, E, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

that was drawn aside on the sabbath and other festivals.* Philo's opinion is the more likely, since we find, by the story of Zachariah's ministry, Luke i., in the temple (which was built after the model of the tabernacle), that the people who were without could not see into the sanctuary.

The inside of the tabernacle was divided into two rooms, by means of a veil or curtain, hung upon four pillars mentioned before. This veil was made of the richest stuff, both for matter and workmanship, and adorned with cherubim and other ornaments, curiously embroidered upon it. It does not appear in the Scripture account, at what distance from either end of the tabernacle this veil was hung; but it is reasonably conjectured, that it divided the tabernacle, in the same proportion in which the temple, afterward built according to its model, was divided; that is, two-thirds of the whole length were allotted to the first room, and one-third to the second; so that the room being beyond the veil, which was called the holy of holies, was exactly square, being ten cubits each way; and the first room, called the sanctuary, was twice as long as broad.

Round the tabernacle there was a spacious area, or court, of one hundred cubits long and fifty broad, surrounded with pillars, set in bases of brass and filletted with silver, at the distance of five cubits from one another. So that there were twenty pillars on each side, and ten at each end of the court. These pillars had silver hooks, on which the hangings were fastened, that formed the inclosure of the court. These hangings were of fine twined linen; Exod. xxvii. 9. The word קלעים *kelangnim*, which we render hangings, is supposed to mean open or net work, from קלע *kalang, sculpsit*. Accordingly the Targum translates it grate-work. So that this inclosure did not wholly conceal the view of the tabernacle, and of the worship performed in the court, from the people that were without.

The entrance into this court was at the east end, facing the tabernacle; where richer hangings, for the space of twenty cubits, were supported by four of the pillars; and these were not fastened like the rest of the hangings, but made either to

* Joseph. Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vi. sect. iv. p. 134, edit. Haverc.

draw or lift up; the text does not say which, but the Jews believe the latter.

It is made a question, whether there was only one court, or more, surrounding the tabernacle. Moses mentions but one; yet David speaks of "the courts of the Lord" in the plural number, Psalm lxxxiv, 2. 10; lxv. 4, *et alibi;* which hath led some people to imagine, there were at least two; one for the Levites, and the other for the people. But this cannot be inferred with any certainty from the word being in the plural number, which is so often used in the Hebrew with a singular signification, to denote the excellency of the thing spoken of. Or otherwise, Moses's account of but one court may be reconciled with David's mentioning more than one, by an easy supposition, that after the settlement in Canaan, when the tabernacle was no longer to be moved about as formerly, they inclosed it and its court with a strong fence, at some distance without the pillars and hangings; which formed an outward court, besides that in which the tabernacle stood.

Though the court surrounded the tabernacle, there is no reason to suppose that the tabernacle stood in the centre of it; for there was no occasion for so large an area at the west end as at the east, where the altar of burnt-offering stood, and several other utensils of the sacred service. It is more probable, that the area at this end was at least fifty cubits square; and indeed a less space than that could hardly suffice for the work that was to be done there, and for the persons who were immediately to attend the service.

Having described the tabernacle and the court that surrounded it, we proceed now to take a view of the furniture that belonged to both.

The chief things in the court were the altar of burnt-offering and the brazen laver. The altar of burnt-offering, which is described in the beginning of the twenty-eighth chapter of Exodus, was placed toward the east end of the court, fronting the entrance of the tabernacle; and we must suppose, at such a convenient distance from it, that the smoke of the fire, which was constantly burning on the altar, might not sully that beautiful tent, its veil and curtains.

The dimensions of the altar were five cubits, or about nineteen feet square, and three cubits, or about five feet and a

half high. It was made of shittim-wood, plated over with brass, and it had four brass rings, through which two bars were put, by which it was carried upon the priests' shoulders. It is described with horns at the four corners, but what was the shape and use of these horns is not now known; perhaps they were for tying the victims, according to the allusion of the Psalmist, "Bind the sacrifice with cords, even to the horns of the altar;" Psalm cxviii. 27.

The fire was kept upon a square grate, suspended by rings at the corners, and, it may be, by chains in the cavity of the altar. The Scripture account does not determine the dimensions of this grate; but if we suppose it to be five feet square, which probably was large enough for the use it was designed for, and if we allow six inches for the thickness of the sides of the altar, there would be a space of one foot and a half between the grate and the altar on every side; which was sufficient to preserve the wooden sides (especially as they were plated over with brass) from being damaged by the fire on the grate.

This grate is said to be put under the compass of the altar, as we understand the word כרכוב *carcobh*, in the only two places where it occurs, Exod. xxvii. 5, and xxxviii. 4. The meaning of it, therefore, can hardly be conjectured, for want of parallel places by which to fix it. Mr. Saurin supposes the כרכוב *carcobh* might be a copper vessel, hung by rings or chains to the altar over the fire on the grate, in which the flesh of the victims was consumed.*

But it is a material objection against this conjecture, that there are some passages, in which it is enjoined, that the victims with the head and the fat should be laid upon the wood, that is, upon the fire which is on the altar; Lev. i. 8.

Others, therefore, conceive the כרכוב *carcobh* to be nothing but a kind of cincture to the grate. Others, again, have imagined it to be a sort of dome over the fire, contrived to collect the flame, and concentre the heat, so as to consume the vapour that would arise from the flesh in burning, and thereby prevent that offensive smell which the burning such quantities of flesh and fat must otherwise have caused. To strengthen this conjecture, the authors of the Universal His-

* See Saurin's Discours sur la Pentateuch, disc. liv., or Chamberlayne's translation, p. 458.

tory tell us, they have seen in France a kind of portable hearth, not unlike a chaffing-dish, so artfully contrived, that the fire within (though not very fierce to outward appearance) consumed feathers, brimstone, and other like fetid materials, without causing the least smell.* Now if such a thing is possible, it is not at all unlikely there might be some such contrivance in the altar, to prevent any offence from the smell of the sacrifices.

The fire on this altar was looked upon as sacred, having first descended upon it from heaven; Lev. ix. 24. It was therefore to be kept constantly burning, and never to go out; chap. vi. 13. From hence, probably, the Chaldeans and Persians borrowed their notion of their sacred fire, which they preserved and nourished with religious care and attention; a custom which afterward passed from them to the Greeks and Romans.

The rabbies have recourse to a miracle, to account for the preserving of the sacred fire in their marches in the wilderness, when the altar was covered with a purple cloth and a covering of badger's skins; Numb. iv. 13, 14. But it may be as well accounted for, by supposing that the grate with the fire was on these occasions taken out of the altar, and carried by itself.

The other considerable utensil in the court of the tabernacle was the brazen laver, described in the thirtieth chapter of Exodus, ver. 18—21. The place of this laver was between the altar and the east end of the tabernacle. Neither the shape nor size of it is mentioned by Moses; probably it was considerably capacious, since it was for the use of all the priests to wash their hands and feet before they performed their ministry.

It is said, that Moses "made the laver of brass, and the foot of it of brass, of the looking-glasses of the women who assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation;" Exod. xxxviii. 8. Such were the ancient mirrors, made of polished brass, or other metal;† which gave but a dark or obscure image, in comparison of glass mirrors. Hence we

* Univers. History, vol. i. part ii. p. 662, folio edit.

† Vid. Ezek. Spanheim, Observ. in Callimach. Hymnum in Pallad. v. 21, p. 548—550, edit. Ultraject. 1697, octavo. The Targum of Jonathan renders the text last quoted, ex æreis speculis.

read of "seeing through a glass darkly," 1 Cor. xiii. 12, or rather "in or by a glass," as δι' εσοπτρου signifies.

As for the custom of the women's assembling at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, that is, the tabernacle of Moses (for it was before the tabernacle of the Lord was reared), some derive it from a custom of the Egyptian women, who (if we may credit Cyril of Alexandria) used to go to the temple with looking-glasses in one hand, and a timbrel in the other.*

The rabbies have represented it as very meritorious in these Jewish women devoutly to sacrifice the most precious ornament of their toilets to holy uses.† Others have suspected a graphical error in the word במראת *bemaroth*, "of the looking-glasses," namely, that the prefix ב *beth* may have slipped into the text, instead of כ *caph*, by reason of the similitude of those letters; and to strengthen this conjecture they observe, that ב *beth* is very seldom used to express the metal or stuff of which any thing is made; though sometimes, it must be owned, it is;‡ as, on mentioning the brass which David collected, it is added, wherewith, בה *bah*, "Solomon made the brazen sea," &c.; 1 Chron. xviii. 8. And it is said of Asa, that "he carried away the stones and timber of Ramah, wherewith Baasha was building, and therewith, בהם *baham*, built Geba and Mizpah;" 2 Chron. xvi. 6. They suppose, however, the true reading of this place was כמראת *chemaroth;* and if so, the proper rendering would be, "Moses made the laver of brass AS or LIKE the looking-glasses of the women," that is, he finely polished it.

Having thus taken a view of the two most considerable things in the court, let us now enter into the tabernacle; where in the sanctuary, or first room, we see the altar of incense, the golden candlestick, and the table of shew-bread.

1st. The altar of incense§ was made of shittim-wood, and overlaid with gold. It was one cubit square, and two high, with an ornament of gold, in the nature, we may suppose, of a

* Vid. Cyril. de Adoratione in Spiritu et Virtute, tom. i. lib. ii. p. 64.

† Vid. Aben-Ezra in Exod. xxxviii. 8.

‡ Vid. Noldii Concordant. Particul. in partic. ב, signif. 14, ex, è Materiæ. And Aben-Ezra vindicates this sense of ב in the place before us. Vid. Cartwright. Electa Targum. Rabbin. in loc.

§ See the description of it in Exod. xxx. 1—10.

carved moulding, round the top of it. The use of it was to burn incense upon every morning and evening. It was also to be sprinkled with the blood of the sacrifices that were offered for the sins of ignorance, committed either by particular persons, or by the people in general: Exod. xxx. 10; Lev. iv. 3. 7. 13. 18.

2dly. The golden candlestick, described Exod. xxv. 31, *et seq.*, was the richest piece of furniture in the tabernacle. It was made of solid gold, to the weight of a talent; and, exclusive of the workmanship, which was very curious, it was worth, according to Cumberland, upward of five thousand seventy-six pounds. It contained seven lights, six branching out in three pairs, from the upright stem, and one on the top of it. This was a most useful, as well as most ornamental, piece of furniture in a room that had no windows.

3dly. The table of shew-bread, described Exod. xxv. 23—30, was made of the same sort of wood with the altar of incense, and, like that, overlaid and ornamented with gold. Its dimensions were two cubits long, one broad, and one and a half high. It is said to have a golden border, or crown, which may be supposed to be a kind of rim round it, something like that of our tea-tables. Upon this table were set two rows or piles of loaves, or cakes of bread, six in a row or pile, which were changed for new ones every sabbath. The stale bread belonged to the priests.

This table was also furnished with golden dishes, spoons, and bowls, of the use of which we have no certain account. Perhaps they were used about the holy oil, which was kept in the tabernacle (see 1 Kings i. 39), and very probably upon this table. Perhaps, also, this was the place of the book of the law of the kingdom, which Samuel wrote, and laid up before the Lord; 1 Sam. x. 25.

We now go, through the second veil, into the holy of holies; where we are to view the ark of the testimony, and its lid or cover, called "the mercy-seat."*

The ark was a chest of fine proportion, two cubits and a half long, one and a half broad, and one and a half high. It was made of shittim-wood, but plated over with gold, both within and without, and richly ornamented with curious work-

* Both these described in Exod. xxv. 10—21.

manship. Its chief use was to be a repository for the two tables of stone, on which were engraven the ten commandments by the finger of God himself, and which he gave to Moses on Mount Sinai; Exod. xxv. 16. These are called the tables of testimony, chap. xxxi. 18, not only as they were a witness and lasting monument of the covenant between God and the people of Israel, but as they would in effect testify against them, if they kept not that covenant. For this end also the book of the law, which Moses wrote, is ordered to be laid in or by the side of the ark; that it "might be there for a witness against the disobedient;" Deut. xxxi. 26. From these tables the ark, in which they were preserved, is called the ark of the testimony, Exod. xxx. 6; and the lid of this chest, which covered these tables of the law, is called "the mercy-seat," as fitly representing the effect of God's mercy to the transgressors of his law; or the covering (as it were) of their transgressions. And hence the word ἱλαστηριον, by which the Septuagint renders the mercy-seat, and which is used for it by the apostle, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. ix. 5, is likewise given to Christ in the Epistle to the Romans, chap. iii. 25, where our translators render it propitiation; inasmuch as, by his death, he hath so covered the transgressions of his people, that they shall not be punished for them.

The upper face of the mercy-seat was adorned with two figures of cherubim, either in chased work, as some think, or in statuary, as it is more commonly understood, and as seems most agreeable to the description of them in the book of Exodus, chap. xxv. 18—20.

We have no sufficient light in Scripture absolutely to determine the form, the posture, or the size of these cherubim.

As to their size, indeed, since they are described as having wings, and their wings are said, when stretched forth on high, to cover the mercy-seat, of which we know the dimensions, upon the reasonable supposition that their wings were in a just proportion to their bodies, we may form some idea of their bigness.

As to their posture, their faces are said "to be toward one another and toward the mercy-seat;" which probably means that they stood in an erect posture on the mercy-seat,

with their faces toward each other, and both of them with their heads somewhat inclined, as looking down upon, contemplating, and admiring the mysteries typified by the ark and mercy-seat on which they stood. This may give occasion to the allusion of St. Peter, when, speaking of the mysteries of redemption, he says, "which things the angels desire to look into;" 1 Pet. i. 12.

But we are at the greatest loss of all to determine the true shape and form of these cherubim. Some, upon observing that the verb כרב *charabh*, in the Syriac language, sometimes means *simulavit*, conceive the noun כרוב *cherubh* signifies no more than an image, figure, or representation of any thing. Aben-Ezra is of this opinion.* Josephus says, they were flying animals, like none of those which are seen by men, but such as Moses saw about the throne of God.† In another place he says, "As for the cherubim, nobody can tell or conceive what they were like."‡ However, the generality of interpreters, both ancient and modern, suppose them to be of a human shape, only with the addition of wings.§ The reason of which supposition is, perhaps, chiefly because Moses describes them as having faces, though that will by no means prove the point, because faces are attributed to beasts as well as to men. It is certain, that what Ezekiel in one place represents as the face of an ox, in another he represents as the face of a cherub, chap. i. 10, compared with chap. x. 14, 15. From whence others have conceived the cherubim to be rather of the shape of flying oxen; and it is alleged in favour of this opinion, that the far more common meaning of the verb כרב *charabh*, in the Arabic, Syriac, and Chaldee, being to plough, the natural meaning of כרוב *cherubh* is a creature used in ploughing, which in the eastern countries was generally the ox.‖ This seems to have been the ancient opinion, which tradition had handed down, concerning the shape of the che-

* See the reasons on which Aben-Ezra grounds his opinion, in Christoph. Cartwright. Electa Targum. Rabbin. in Exod. xxv. 18.

† Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vi. sect. v. p. 135, 136, edit. Havercamp.

‡ Antiq. lib. viii. cap. iii. sect. iii. p. 424, edit. Haverc.

§ That this was the opinion of several rabbies, see in Cartwright, ubi supra.

‖ Bochart. Hierozoic. part. i. lib. ii. cap. xxxv. Oper. tom. ii. p. 358, edit. 1712.

rubim with the flaming sword, that guarded the tree of life; Gen. iii. 24. And Ovid's fable concerning Jason's golden fleece being guarded by brazen-footed bulls, which breathed out fire, was, perhaps, grounded upon it:

> Ecce adamanteis Vulcanum naribus efflant
> Æripides tauri. Metamorph. lib. vii. l. 104.

We observe farther, that as Ezekiel describes the face of a cherub and the face of an ox as the same, so St. John, in his description of the four ξωα, or living creatures, which he saw in his vision, and which seem in all respects to answer to the four living creatures in Ezekiel's vision, calls that the calf, which Ezekiel calls the ox or cherub; Rev. iv. 7. From hence we may give a probable account of the strangest part of the story of Jeroboam's idolatry, his setting up the two golden calves for objects of worship in Dan and Bethel; 1 Kings xii. 28, 29. I call it the strangest part, because it appears wonderful, not only that Jeroboam himself should be so stupid as to set up calves for gods, but that the bulk of the nation should so readily fall into such senseless idolatry; but it relieves our conceptions, if we consider these calves as nothing but cherubim, the very same sort of figures that were placed in the temple by God's own appointment: so that Jeroboam not only set up the worship of the same God, and in the same modes and forms that were practised at Jerusalem, but the same symbols of the Divine presence to which the people had been accustomed. It is, therefore, no wonder they so generally fell in with him in some little alterations, particularly as to the place of their most solemn public worship, especially if we attend to the plausible things he might allege on this head; namely, that it was a usual practice of the holy patriarchs to build altars, and to worship God, wherever they came and made any stay. Abraham sacrificed in Shechem, and at Bethel, in the plain of Mamre, and at Beersheba. The ark and the tabernacle were many years at Shiloh, and there the people sacrificed. It was from hence moved to Kirjath-jearim, and after that to several other places, in all which sacrifices were offered to God with acceptance. At length David, and then Solomon his son, having chosen to fix their court at Jerusalem, and to have the temple near to the royal

palace, it was built in that city. However, the whole land is holy; and they should not be so superstitious as to imagine the presence of God is limited to one place more than another, but wherever his pure worship is performed, he would meet his people and bless them. Or if it should be alleged, that Solomon had built the temple at Jerusalem by the express appointment of God, might not Jeroboam reply, that Solomon had so defiled that city by his lewdness and his idolatries, that it was now become an impure place; and any other, therefore, might surely be as proper for the most solemn worship, especially Bethel, the house of God, the place where he had anciently chose to dwell?* Thus might Jeroboam vindicate his conduct, perhaps as well as any will-worshipper could ever do. Nevertheless, as he went contrary to a divine institution, his cherubim are contemptuously called calves, and he is frequently branded as that great sinner who made Israel to sin, which should be a caution to us by no means to depart from, but to keep close to, divine institutions in all matters of religious worship.†

To return to the cherubim. Clemens of Alexandria seems to have been of opinion, that the Egyptian sphynx, and other hieroglyphical beasts, were borrowed from these cherubim and those in Ezekiel's vision.‡ Hence it appears, that he did not

* The greatest part of the speech which I have put into the mouth of Jeroboam, is taken from Josephus, who seems to have supposed, that the sin of this prince was not worshipping another God, but, for political reasons, worshipping the true God in a manner contrary to his institution. Joseph. Antiq. lib. viii. cap. viii. p. 445, edit. Havercamp.

† Concerning the figure of the cherubim, and the sin of Jeroboam in erecting such in Dan and Bethel, in imitation of those at Jerusalem, see Moncæus de Vitulo Aureo, cap. iv.—ix., apud Criticos Sacros, tom. ix. p. 4429, et seq. In cap. x. et seq., he answers the objections to his opinion. A short abstract of what he offers on the subject may be seen in Pool's Synopsis on 1 Kings xii. 29. It is remarkable, that the author, who was a Papist, takes occasion, from this sin of Jeroboam, to harangue the Protestants, and the king of Great Britain in particular, on the heinous guilt of schism. There would have been more propriety in his addressing the Church of Rome, and her infallible head, the Pope, on the guilt of abrogating or dispensing with divine institutions. Consult, likewise, on this subject, Bochart. Hierozoic. part i. lib. ii. cap. xxxv. Oper. tom. ii. p. 354—360.

‡ Strom. lib. v. apud Oper. p. 566, 567, edit. Paris, 1641.

take them to be, entirely at least, of a human form and shape.*

It was between these two cherubim, over the mercy-seat, that the Shechinah, or miraculous light, used to appear, as the visible token of the special presence of God:† from whence he is said to "dwell between the cherubim," Psalm lxxx. 1; and "to sit between the cherubim;" Psalm xcix. 1. In consequence of which the people are called upon to worship at his footstool, ver. 5, that is, the ark and the mercy-seat.

We have before observed, that the two tables of the law, which God gave to Moses, were deposited in the ark under the mercy-seat; and with them were laid up, it should seem in the same chest, the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded. For the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, speaking of the tabernacle, σκηνη ἡ λεγομενη ἁγια ἁγιων, which is called the holiest of all, which had the golden censer, and the ark, την κιβωτον, of the covenant, adds, wherein εν ᾗ, was the pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; Heb. ix. 3, 4. But how to reconcile this passage, if we understand it to assert, that the

* On this head consult Dr. Watts on the figure of a cherub, in his Remnants of Time improved, in his Works, vol. iv.; and Witsii Ægyptiaca, lib. ii. cap. xiii.

† This Shechinah, or visible glory of Jehovah, after it had conducted the Israelites through the wilderness (see p. 14), had its more stated residence in the tabernacle and the temple. For a farther account of this miraculous phenomenon, consult part ii. chap. ii. of Mr. Lowman's Rationale of the Hebrew Ritual. There are some remarkable things in Lord Barrington's Dissertation on God's Visible Presence, at the end of the second edit. of his Essay; and in p. 39 of his Essay, note xii., where he hath endeavoured to trace this divine appearance from the creation till a little after the flood, and from the giving of the law to the destruction of the first temple. Toland's attempt to prove that this apprehended miraculous appearance had nothing miraculous in it, but was only a kind of beacon made use of by the Israelites for their direction in their journey (see his "Hodegus, or Pillar of Cloud and Fire not miraculous," in his piece called Tetradymus), was answered in a pamphlet called "Hodegus Confuted, or a plain Demonstration, that the Pillar of Cloud and Fire, that guided the Israelites in the Wilderness, was not a Fire of human Preparation, but the most miraculous Presence of God," published 1721, 8vo. And likewise in "A Discourse upon the Pillar of Cloud and Fire," &c. inserted in the Bibliotheca Literaria, 1723, Numb. v. p. 1, and following. The sentiments of the Jewish writers upon this subject may be seen in Buxtorf. Exercitat. de Arcâ Fœderis.

pot of manna, and Aaron's rod, were laid up in the ark, with the assertion in the First Book of Kings, that there was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone which Moses put there at Horeb, 1 Kings viii. 9, is somewhat difficult. Some say, the apostle speaks of the ark as it was in the time of Moses; the text in Kings, as it was in Solomon's time, when upon some occasion or other, the pot of manna and Aaron's rod had been taken out of it. But this is hardly probable. Therefore εν ᾗ, in which, must either signify "near to which," in which sense the particle εν is sometimes used;* or rather, I apprehend, εν ᾗ, in which, refers not to κιβωτον, the ark, immediately preceding, but to the remote antecedent, σκηνῃ ᾗ λεγομενῃ ἁγια ἁγιων, the second tabernacle, or holy of holies; and is parallel to the expression which just before occurs, σκηνῃ γαρ κατεσκευασθῃ ἡ πρωτῃ, "there was a first tabernacle made, wherein, εν ᾗ, was the candlestick and the table," &c.

That the tabernacle and all its furniture were typical and emblematical of spiritual blessings,† we are assured by the apostle; Heb. ix. 9, and x. 1, *et alibi*. But for the particular meaning of these several mysteries we refer to Witsius's Dissertation de Tabernaculi Mysteriis, in the first volume of his Miscellanea.‡

Of the Temple.

Having taken a survey of the tabernacle, we proceed to the temple at Jerusalem, which was built much after the model of the former edifice, but every way in a more magnificent and expensive manner.

According to the opinion of some persons, there were three different temples; the first built by David and Solomon; the second by Zerubbabel, and Joshua the high-priest; and the third by Herod, a little before the birth of Christ. The Jews acknowledge only two;§ for they do not allow the third to be

* See Whitby in loc.

† Vid. Deyling. Observ. Sacr. part i. obser. xvii. p. 68.

‡ On this subject consult Buxtorf's Exercitat. de Arcâ Fœderis. And with respect to the tabernacle, as well as all its furniture, read Joseph. Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vi.

§ Vid. Reland. Antiq. Hebr. part i. cap. vi. sect. ii. p. 58, edit. 1717, and the passages of the Talmud there quoted.

a new temple, but only the second rebuilt. And this best agrees with the prophecy of Haggai, chap. ii. 9; that "the glory of this latter house, namely, Zerubbabel's temple, should be greater than that of the former," which undoubtedly was said in reference to the Messiah's honouring it with his personal presence and ministry.

The first temple was built by David and Solomon. David provided materials for it before his death, and Solomon raised the edifice. It stood on Mount Zion, Psalm cxxxii. 13, 14; which was the general name of a range of hills in that neighbourhood. The name of that particular hill on which the temple stood, was Moriah; 2 Chron. iii. 1. The Jews will have it to be the very spot on which Abraham went about to sacrifice Isaac; and where Adam paid his first devotions after his creation, and sacrificed after his fall. This hill had been purchased by David of Araunah, or Ornan, king of the Jebusites.*

It is remarkable, that though in the Second Book of Samuel we have an account that "David purchased the threshing floor of Ornan, with the oxen, for fifty shekels of silver," chap. xxiv. 24; in the First Book of Chronicles it is said, "he gave to Ornan, for the place, six hundred shekels of gold;" chap. xxi. 25. To solve this difficulty, some learned men, observing that the words כסף *kassaph*, and זהב *zahab*, which we render silver and gold in these two passages, are both used sometimes for money in general, imagine that the former sum was fifty shekels of gold, and the latter six hundred shekels of silver; and if so, both amount to much the same value, about five hundred and forty-seven pounds. But it seems an easier and more natural supposition, that the former sum was for the floor, oxen, and wooden instruments only, and the latter was afterward paid for the whole hill, whereon David chose to build the temple.†

* 2 Sam. xxiv. 23, where the literal version is, "All this did Araunah, the king, give unto the king."

† Capel, in his Critica Sacra, lib. i. cap. x. sect. x. p. 37, supposes, that these different numbers are owing to the blunder of some transcriber, and are therefore most easily reconciled by admitting a various lection. And many of this learned man's conjectures, to his immortal honour, are confirmed by the Hebrew manuscripts, as Dr. Kennicott hath had occasion to observe; and perhaps this may appear in various other instances, when

The expense of erecting this magnificent structure was prodigious; and, indeed, according to the common acceptation of the Scripture account, next to incredible; the gold and silver only, which was provided for that purpose, amounting to upward of eight thousand millions sterling, 1 Chron. xxii. 14; xxix. 4. 6, 7; which, says Dr. Prideaux, was sufficient to have built the whole temple with solid silver,* and greatly exceeds all the treasures of all the monarchs in Christendom.

But it may be observed, that the number of these talents, by which the gold and silver is computed, is mentioned only in the book of Chronicles, which was undoubtedly written after the return from the Babylonish captivity, as appears from its mentioning Cyrus's decree for the building the temple, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23; and from its carrying the genealogy beyond Zerubbabel, who was one of the chiefs that returned from Babylon, 1 Chron. iii. 19; and it is not, therefore, improbable, that at the time of writing this book the Jews might compute by the Babylonish talent, which was little more than half the Mosaic talent, or perhaps by the Syriac talent, which was but one-fifth of the Babylonish; and thus the whole mass of gold and silver would be reduced to a comparatively moderate quantity, and yet be abundantly sufficient to build a most magnificent temple.

The plan, and the whole model of this structure, was laid by the same divine Architect as that of the tabernacle, namely, God himself; chap. xxviii. 11, 12. We may reasonably, therefore, conclude, it was the completest building that was ever erected; and it is no improbable conjecture of those who are for deriving all the Grecian orders and just ornaments in architecture from this temple.

It was built, as was said before, much in the same form with the tabernacle, only every way of larger dimensions. It was surrounded, except the front, or east end, with three stories of chambers, each five cubits square, which reached to half the height of the temple; and the front was graced with a magnificent portico, which rose to the height of an hundred and twenty cubits. So that the shape of the whole was not

that gentleman hath finished his great work of the collation, in which he is now engaged.

* Prideaux's Connect. part i. book i. vol. i. p. 7, 8, note q.

unlike some churches we have seen, which have a lofty tower in the front, and a lower aisle running along each side of the building.

The utensils for sacred service were the same as in the tabernacle; only several of them, as the altar, candlestick, &c., were larger in proportion to the more spacious edifice to which they belonged. This first temple was at length plundered by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, of all its rich furniture, and the building itself destroyed, after it had stood, according to Josephus, four hundred and seventy years, six months, and ten days, from its dedication.* Though other chronologers, as particularly Calvisius and Scaliger, reduce the number of years to four hundred and twenty-seven or eight; and Usher, to four hundred and twenty-four, three months, and eight days.†

The second temple was built by the Jews upon their return from the Babylonish captivity, under the influence and direction of Zerubbabel their governor, and of Joshua the high-priest, with the leave and by the encouragement of Cyrus, the Persian emperor, to whom Judea was now become a tributary kingdom. This is that Cyrus, of whom Isaiah had prophesied by name two hundred years before he was born, and had predicted his encouraging the rebuilding Jerusalem and the temple; chap. xliv. 28; xlv. 1. It is probable that Daniel had showed Cyrus this prophecy, and that Cyrus refers to it in his proclamation for rebuilding the temple: "The Lord God," saith he, "hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and charged me to build him a house in Jerusalem;" Ezra i. 2. He also restored the sacred utensils which Nebuchadnezzar had put in the temples of his god; and not only gave leave to the Jews to rebuild their temple, but encouraged his own people to assist them with presents for carrying on the work; chap. i. 4. Upon which the foundation of a new building was laid, with great rejoicing of the people; only some old men, who remembered the glory of Solomon's temple, and had no expectation that this, which was erecting by a few poor exiles, just returned to their own country, could ever equal that in

* Antiq. lib. x. cap. viii. sect. v. p. 528, edit Haverc.

† Usser. Annal. A.M. 3416, p. 71, and Scaliger de Emend. Temp. p. 400, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1629.

magnificence, wept with a loud voice, while others were shouting with joy; chap. iii. 12, 13. However, the work, which was thus cheerfully begun, went on but slowly, partly for want of zeal for God's honour and worship, for which they were reproved by the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, and partly, also, through the envy and malice of their neighbours, the Samaritans, who, by their ill offices at court, prevailed with the emperor to put a stop to the work; chap. iv. 23, 24. At length, after an intermission of about thirteen years, it was vigorously reassumed under the encouragement of the emperor Darius, and completely finished in the sixth year of his reign; chap. vi. 15. Upon which the new temple was dedicated with great solemnity and much rejoicing; ver. 16, 17.

That there was really a very considerable difference and disparity between the old and this new temple is very certain, not only from the old men's lamentation before mentioned, but from the following passage of the prophet Haggai: "Who is left amongst you, that saw this house in its first glory? And how do you see it now? Is it not in your eyes, in comparison of it, as nothing?" chap. ii. 3. And also from the promise which God gave them, in order to comfort them on this occasion, that he would raise the glory of this latter temple above that of the former, by the presence of the Messiah in it; ver. 9.

The Jews tell us, the second temple wanted five remarkable things, which were the chief glory of the first temple: the ark and mercy-seat:—the divine presence, or visible glory in the holy of holies, which they call the Shechinah:—the holy fire on the altar, which had been first kindled from heaven:—the Urim and Thummim:—and the spirit of prophecy.

This temple was plundered and wretchedly profaned by Antiochus Epiphanes, who not only rifled it of all its riches, but caused it to be polluted by sacrificing swine's flesh upon the altar. He also caused the public worship in it to cease.*

It was afterward purified, and the divine worship restored by Judas Maccabæus, on which occasion the temple, or at least the altar, was dedicated anew, and an annual festival was instituted in commemoration of this happy event. This is

* Joseph. Antiq. lib. xii. cap. v. sect. iv. p. 609, edit. Haverc.; and 1 Maccab. i. 20—24, and 45—47.

the feast of dedication which we read of in the Gospel of St. John, chap. x. 22, and which is said to be in winter, and could not, therefore, be kept in remembrance of the dedication of the temple of Solomon; for that was in the seventh month, which is just after harvest, 1 Kings viii. 2; nor of Zerubbabel's temple, which was dedicated in the month Adar, in the spring. It must, therefore, be the festival which was instituted by Judas Maccabæus, on his having purified the temple and altar from the pollution of Antiochus. This feast was celebrated for eight days successively, from the twenty-fifth day of the month Casleu, answering to our December; 1 Maccab. iv. 59. And it is also mentioned by Josephus as a festival to which great regard was paid in his time.* This festival is still observed by the Jews; yet not as a time of rejoicing, but of mourning, on account of the destruction of their temple, and the calamities which have befallen their nation.

When this second temple was grown old, and out of repair, having stood five hundred years, king Herod, in order to ingratiate himself with the Jews, and to perpetuate his own memory, offered to rebuild it: which brings us,

Thirdly. To Herod's temple, which was a far more magnificent structure than Zerubbabel's, and came much nearer to the glory of Solomon's. Tacitus, the Roman historian, calls it "Immensæ opulentiæ templum," a temple of immense opulence.† Josephus says, it was the most astonishing structure he had ever seen or heard of, as well on account of its architecture as its magnitude, and likewise the richness and magnificence of its various parts, and the fame and reputation of its sacred appurtenances.‡ As for Rabbi Jehuda, the compiler of the Talmud, and other more modern writers, who have given us descriptions of this temple, which none of them had ever seen, we can have little dependence on their accounts, especially as they differ so much from one another, each having, in a manner, erected a separate edifice; to which one cannot help suspecting, that the strength of imagination has sometimes contributed more largely than the knowledge of

* Antiq. lib. xii. cap. vii. sect. vii. p. 617, edit. Haverc.

† Tacit. Histor. lib. v. sect. viii. p. 202, edit. Glasg. 1743.

‡ Joseph. de Bell. Judaic. lib. vi. cap. iv. sect. viii. p. 386, edit. Haverc.

history. But Josephus was himself a priest in the temple he describes, and wrote soon after its destruction, when, if he had given a false, or remarkably inaccurate account, he might have been contradicted by numbers who had viewed it as well as himself. For that reason, he is to be credited beyond any of the rest,* though one cannot avoid suspecting, that even in his description there is some panegyric exceeding the bounds of truth, intermixed with faithful and exact narrative; for instance, when he tells us of some stones in the building forty-five cubits long, five high, and six broad. That there were, indeed, some extraordinary large stones, may be collected from the following passage of the evangelist Mark: "And as he went out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings are here!" chap. xiii. 1. And in Luke they are styled "goodly stones;" chap. xxi. 5. But I apprehend it would puzzle all the mathematicians of the present age to contrive machines by which stones of such prodigious weight and size, as those mentioned by Josephus, could be raised and managed. We are to consider he wrote before the invention of printing, when books could not be soon and easily published and dispersed into many hands, as they now are. It is possible, therefore, a vain desire of exalting the glory of his nation, might prevail with him, in some cases, above a strict regard to truth, when it was probable, none, who were able to contradict him, might ever see his book; or if they should, and were of his own nation, they would not be inclined to do it.†

Hitherto we have only considered the temple itself, which consisted of the portico, the sanctuary, and the holy of holies. But this was only a small part of the sacred building on the top of Mount Moriah; for the temple was surrounded with spacious courts, making a square of half a mile in circumference.

* See his Description of the Temple, de Bell. Judaic. lib. v. cap. v. p. 331, et seq.

† There is, however, a surprising account in Mr. Maundrel's Travels, p. 138, edit. 1749, Oxon, of the size of some stones, which, he saith, he saw himself in a wall which encompassed the temple of Balbec; one stone was twenty-one, and two others each twenty yards long, four yards deep, and as many broad. And the authors of the Universal History quote De La Roque, a French author, as giving the same account.

The first court, which encompassed the temple and the other courts, was called the court of the Gentiles; because Gentiles were allowed to come into it, but no farther. It was enclosed with a wall, twenty cubits high, on the top of which were chambers, or galleries, supported by the wall on the outer side, and by rows of columns on the inside; as the sides of the Royal Exchange, or the Piazzas in Covent Garden are. These piazzas of the temple are called στοαι by Josephus, and in the New Testament; which we translate porches, though not very properly, for the English word porch conveys a very different idea from the Greek word στοα, which is better rendered piazza. That on the east side was called Solomon's piazza (see John x. 23; Acts iii. 11), because it stood upon a vast terrace, which he built up from the valley beneath, four hundred cubits high, in order to enlarge the area on the top of the mountain, and make it equal to the plan of his intended building. As this terrace was the only work of Solomon's remaining in Herod's temple, the piazza, that stood upon it, still retained the name of the former prince.

Of the same kind with these piazzas were doubtless the five στοαι, which surrounded the pool of Bethesda; John v. 2. The pool was probably a pentagon, and the piazzas round it were designed to shelter from the weather the multitude of diseased persons who lay waiting for a cure by the miraculous virtue of those waters.

Within this outward great court was a less court, of an oblong, rectangular figure, near to the west end of which the temple stood. Into this court none but Israelites might enter. It was also surrounded with a wall, and adorned with piazzas, in the manner of the great court. The rabbies speak of two walls, and a space between them of ten cubits broad, which they call the חיל *chel*, that parted the court of the Israelites from the court of the Gentiles. This is what they understand by the word חיל in the Lamentations of Jeremiah, chap. ii. 8; "He made the *chel* and the wall to lament; they languished together."* But however that be, the wall that divided be-

* Vid. Maimon. de Ædificio Templi, cap. vii. sect. iii. p. 39, Crenii Fasciculi Sexti. There is, however, a mistake in the translation; instead of

tween the court of the Gentiles and the court of the Israelites is evidently alluded to in the following passage of St. Paul: "But now in Christ Jesus, ye, who sometime were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ: for he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us," Eph. ii. 13, 14: which expresses the union of the Jews and Gentiles in one church by Jesus Christ.

In the outer court was probably kept the market of beasts for sacrifice, which is mentioned by St. John, chap. ii. 14; and there likewise were the money-changers, which he also speaks of, who for a small gratuity furnished people, in exchange for other coin, with half shekels, for payment of the annual tribute which every Israelite was to give into the sacred treasury.

The court of the Israelites was divided into two parts. The first, entering at the east end, was called the court of the women, because they were allowed to come no nearer the temple than that court. Of this, indeed, we have no account in Scripture, except it be the same that was called, in Jehoshaphat's time, the new court; 2 Chron. xx. 5. There seem to have been but two courts originally belonging to Solomon's temple; one called "the court of the priests;" the other, "the great court," chap. iv. 9; and we read that "Manasseh built altars for all the hosts of heaven, in the two courts of the house of the Lord;" chap. xxxiii. 5. In the great, or outward court, devout Gentiles were allowed to pay their devotion to the God of Israel; and in the court of the priests, or the inner court, the priests and other Israelites worshipped. And as in those times there seems to have been no other distinction of courts but these two, the setting the women at a greater distance from the temple, and from the special tokens of God's presence, than the men, must have been the contrivance of some later ages, without any divine institution, that we find, to support it.

In this court of the women there was placed one chest, or

being altitudine, in height ten cubits, it should be latitudine, in breadth. Vid. Mishn. tit. Middoth. cap. ii. sect. iii. L'Empereur, not. 3, in loc. tom. v. p. 326, Surenhus.

more, the Jews say eleven, for receiving the voluntary contributions of the people toward defraying the charges of public worship: such as providing the public sacrifices, wood for the altar, salt, and other necessaries. That part of the area where these chests were placed, was the γαζοφυλακιον, or treasury, mentioned by St. Mark, chap. xii. 41. And perhaps the whole court, or at least the piazza on one side and the chambers over it, in which the sacred stores were kept, was from hence called by the same name; as the following passage of St. John seems to imply: "These words spake Jesus in the treasury, as he taught in the temple;" John viii. 20.

From the court of the women, which was on higher ground than the court of the Gentiles, they ascended by fifteen steps into the inner court, in which the temple and altar stood. Into this court, not only the priests, but all male Israelites might enter. Nevertheless, in this court there was a distinction made in Herod's temple, of which we read nothing in Solomon's, between the court of the priests and that of the people. The court of the priests was nothing but an inclosure of a rail or wall of one cubit high, round about the altar, at a convenient distance from it, to which the people were to bring their offerings and sacrifices; but none beside the priests were allowed to come within that enclosure.

From hence probably the Papists have taken the hint of railing in their altars.

Herod began to build the temple about sixteen years before the birth of Christ, and so far completed it in nine years and a half, that it was fit for divine service. In all which time, the Jews say, it never rained in the day time, but only in the night, that the sacred building might not be retarded. However, the outbuildings of the courts were not finished till several years after our Saviour's death; so that when he was about thirty years old, the temple had been forty-six in building: which is the meaning of this passage in the evangelist John: "Forty and six years was," ωκοδομηθη, which should rather be rendered, hath been, "this temple in building;" chap. ii. 20.

The external glory of this latter temple consisted not only

in the opulence and magnificence of the building, but in the rich gifts, *αναθηματα*, with which it was adorned, and which excited the admiration of those who beheld them; Luke xxi. 5. The hanging up of *αναθηματα*, or consecrated gifts, was common in most of the ancient temples; as we find it particularly was in the temple at Jerusalem; where, among the rest, was a golden table given by Pompey, and several golden vines of exquisite workmanship, and of an immense size, with clusters, saith Josephus, *ανδρομηκεις*, as tall as a man.*

This magnificent temple was at length, through the righteous judgment of God on that wicked and abandoned nation, who had literally turned it into a den of thieves, utterly destroyed by the Romans, on the same month, and on the same day of the month, on which Solomon's temple was destroyed by the Babylonians.†

* Joseph. de Bell. Judaic. lib. v. cap. v. sect. iv. p. 333, edit. Haverc.

† On this subject may be consulted Lightfoot's Description of the Temple, and Capel's Templi Hierosolymitani triplex delineatio ex Villalpando, Josepho, Maimonide et Talmude, prefixed to Walton's Polyglot.

CHAPTER II.

THE SYNAGOGUES, SCHOOLS, AND HOUSES OF PRAYER.

The term synagogue, primarily signifying an assembly, came, like the word church, to be applied to places in which any assemblies, especially those for the worship of God, met, or were convened. The Jews use it in the primary sense, when they speak of the great synagogue; meaning the court of seventy elders, which they pretend to have been instituted originally by Moses, and the members of which they afterward increased to one hundred and twenty.

We are now to treat of synagogues, chiefly in the latter sense; namely, as denoting places of worship. And thus they were a kind of chapels of ease to the temple, and originally intended for the convenience of such as lived too remote statedly to attend the public worship there. But in the latter ages of the Jewish state, synagogues were multiplied far beyond what such convenience required. If we may believe the rabbies, there were no less than four hundred and eighty, or, according to others, four hundred and sixty,* of them in Jerusalem, where the temple stood. So great a number indeed exceeds all reasonable belief. Nevertheless, it is easy to imagine, that as the erecting synagogues came to be considered as a very meritorious work of piety (see Luke vii. 4, 5), the number might soon be increased, by the superstition of religious zealots, beyond all necessity or convenience.

The almost profound silence of the Old Testament concerning synagogues hath induced several learned men to con-

* Gemar. Hierosol. tit. Megill. cap. iii. fol. 73, col. 4, and tit. Cethuboth, cap. xiii. fol. 35, col. 3. Vid. Selden. Prolegom. in librum de Successionibus in Bona Defunctorum, p. 15, 16, apud Opera, vol. ii. tom. i. Or Lightfoot, Centur. Chorograph. Matt. xxvi.

clude, that they had a very late original. Mr. Basnage supposes them to be coeval with the traditions in the time of the Asmonean princes, but a few ages before Christ. Dr. Prideaux does not admit there were any synagogues before the Babylonish captivity.* Vitringa is of the same opinion, and hath said a great deal in support of it.† In favour of which sentiment Reland also quotes some passages from the rabbies.‡ But I cannot think their arguments are conclusive. For, in the seventy-fourth Psalm, which seems to have been written on occasion of the Babylonish captivity, there is mention made of their enemies having burnt or destroyed "all the synagogues of God in the land," כל-מועדי-אל בארץ *col-mongnadhè-èl baarets*, Psalm lxxiv. 8: in which passage not only מועדי *mongnadhè*, from יעד *jangnadh, convenire fecit ad locum tempusque statutum*, seems to be properly translated synagogues, where the people were statedly to meet for divine worship; but the words כל *col* and בארץ *baarets*, all the synagogues of God in the land, being added, prevent our understanding this expression, as some do, only of the temple, and the holy places belonging to it at Jerusalem. Vitringa seems sensible of the force of this argument, and endeavours, therefore, to show, that the phrase may either mean all the places throughout the land, where God had occasionally met his people in old time, and which, on that account, were had in peculiar veneration; or, at least, the schools and academies of the prophets. An interpretation which seems not very natural; and indeed this learned author himself was so doubtful of it, that he adds, discerning persons will not imagine, that this one passage, which is of an uncertain sense, is sufficient to counterbalance the arguments I have produced, to prove that synagogues were of a later original.

Again, I observe, that St. James speaks of Moses being read in the synagogues "of old time;" Acts xv. 21. And indeed it can hardly be imagined, that the bulk of a nation, which was the only visible church of God in the world, should, in their purest times, in the days of Joshua, Samuel, and David, seldom or never pay him any public worship: and

* Connect. vol. ii. p. 534—536.

† Vitring. de Synag. Vet. lib. i. part ii. cap. ix.—xii.

‡ Reland. Antiq. Sacr. part i. cap. x. sect. iii. p. 128, 129, 3d edit. 1717.

this must have been the case, if they had no other places for it besides the tabernacle; and on this supposition likewise the Sabbath could not be kept according to the law, which required a holy convocation, מקרא-קדש *mikra-kodhesh*, on, or for, that day, in, or among, all their dwellings, or throughout the whole land; Lev. xxiii. 3. The word מקרא *mikra*, which we render a convocation, seems more naturally to import a place of public worship in which the people assembled than the assembly itself. As in the following passage of Isaiah: "And the Lord will create upon every dwelling place of mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, מקראיה *mikrajeha*, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night," chap. iv. 5: in which there is a manifest allusion to the tabernacle, whereon the cloud and pillar of fire rested in the wilderness; Exod. xl. 38. And what then could these מקראי קדש *mikrè kodhesh* be, but synagogues, or edifices for public worship?*

However, the dispute perhaps may be compromised if we allow that the custom of erecting those sorts of chapels, in later ages called synagogues, and appropriated to public worship alone, first began after the return from the captivity; and that in former times, from their first settlement in the land of Canaan, the people used to meet either in the open air, or in dwelling houses, particularly in the houses of the prophets (as seems to be intimated in the husband of the Shunamite inquiring of her, when she was going to Elisha's house on occasion of the death of her son, "Wherefore wilt thou go to him to day? It is neither new moon nor Sabbath," 2 Kings iv. 23), or in any other place or building convenient for the purpose.

But though we cannot help concluding they had extempore synagogues, if we may so style them, without which religious assemblies could not be ordinarily held, from their first settlement in Canaan; nevertheless, it must be acknowledged, these assemblies were sometimes neglected, and in a manner laid aside, for years together; which made it necessary for Jehoshaphat to send Levites, a sort of itinerant preachers, with a book of the law with them, throughout the cities of Judah;

* See on this subject, Leydecker. de Republ. Hebr. lib. viii. cap. v. sect. ii.

2 Chron. xvii. 9. And from the long disuse of reading it in such public assemblies, the knowledge of the law was at a very low ebb in Josiah's time; which may be supposed, in part, to have occasioned the pleasure and surprise of the king and of Hilkiah the high-priest, when the book, or autograph, of the law, which had been long neglected and lost, was found, as they were repairing the temple; 2 Kings xxii. 8.

In the sixth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles there is mention made of the synagogue of the Libertines, ver. 9; concerning whom there are different opinions, two of which bid fairest for the truth. The first is that of Grotius and Vitringa,* that they were Italian Jews or proselytes. The ancient Romans distinguished between *libertus* and *libertinus*. *Libertus* was one who had been a slave, and obtained his freedom;† *libertinus* was the son of a *libertus*.‡ But this distinction in after-ages was not strictly observed; and *libertinus* also came to be used for one not born, but made free, in opposition to *ingenuus*, or one born free.§ Whether the *libertini* mentioned in this passage of the Acts were Gentiles, who had become proselytes to Judaism, or native Jews, who having been made slaves to the Romans were afterward set at liberty,‖ and in remembrance of their captivity called them-

* Grot. in loc.; Vitring. de Synag. Vetere, lib. i. part i. cap. xiv. p. 254, 255.

† Cives Romani sunt Liberti, qui vindicta, censu aut testamento, nullo jure impediente manumissi sunt. Ulpian. tit. i. sect. vi.

‡ This appears from the following passage of Suetonius concerning Claudius, who, he says, was ignarus temporibus Appii et deinceps aliquamdiu Libertinos dictos, non ipsos, qui manumitterentur, sed ingenuos ex his procreatos. In Vitâ Claudi, cap. xxiv. sect. iv. p. 78, Pitisci.

§ Quintilian. de Institutione Oratoriâ, lib. v. cap. x. p. 246, edit. Gibson, 1693. Qui servus est, si manumittatur fit Libertinus. Justinian. Institut. lib. i. tit. v.: Libertini sunt, qui ex justâ servitute manumissi sunt. Tit. iv. Ingenuus est is, qui statim ut natus est, liber est; sive ex duobus ingenuis matrimonio editus est, sive ex libertinis duobus, sive ex altero libertino, et altero ingenuo.

‖ Of these there were great numbers at Rome. Tacitus informs us (Annal. lib. ii. cap. lxxxv.), that four thousand Libertini of the Jewish superstition, as he styles it, were banished at one time, by order of Tiberius, into Sardinia; and the rest commanded to quit Italy, if they did not abjure by a certain day. See also Suetonius in Vitâ Tiberii, cap. xxxvi.; Josephus (Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. iii. sect. v. edit. Haverc.) mentions the same fact; and Philo (Legat. ad Caium, p. 785, C, edit. Colon. 1613) speaks of a good

selves *libertini*, and formed a synagogue by themselves, is differently conjectured by the learned.*

It is probable, the Jews of Cyrenia, Alexandria, &c., built synagogues at Jerusalem at their own charge, for the use of their brethren who came from those countries; as the Danes, Swedes, &c., build churches for the use of their own countrymen in London; and that the Italian Jews did the same; and because the greatest number of them were *libertini*, their synagogue was therefore called the synagogue of the Libertines.

The other opinion, which is hinted by Oecumenius on the Acts,† and mentioned by Dr. Lardner, as more lately advanced by Mr. Daniel Gerdes,‡ professor of divinity in the university of Groningen, is this, that the Libertines are so called from a city or country called Libertus, or Libertina, in Africa, about Carthage. Suidas, in his Lexicon, on the word λιβερτινος, says it was ονομα εθνους, *nomen gentis*. And the *glossa interlinearis*, of which Nicolas de Lyra made great use in his notes, hath over the word *libertini, è regione*, denoting that they were so styled from a country.

In the acts of the famous conference with the Donatists at Carthage, anno 411, there is mentioned one Victor, bishop of the church of Libertina: and in the acts of the Lateran Council, which was held in 649, there is mention of *Januarius gratia Dei episcopus sanctæ ecclesiæ Libertinensis;* and therefore Fabricius, in his Geographical Index of Christian Bishoprics, has placed Libertina in what was called Africa Propria, or the proconsular province of Africa. Now, as all the other people of the several synagogues, mentioned in this passage of the Acts, are denominated from the places from whence they came; it is probable, that the Libertines were so too; and as the Cyrenians and Alexandrians, who came from Africa, are placed next to the Libertines in that cata-

part of the city beyond the Tiber, as inhabited by Jews, who were mostly Libertini, having been brought to Rome as captives and slaves, but being made free by their masters, were permitted to live according to their own rites and customs.

* Vid. Selden, de Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. ii. cap. v. Oper. vol. i. tom. i. p. 200, 201; et Alting. de Proselytis.

† In loc. tom. i. p. 57.

‡ Vid. ejus Exercit. Academ. lib. iii. Amstel. 1728, 4to.

logue, it is probable they also belonged to the same country. So that, upon the whole, there is little reason to doubt of the Libertines being so called from the place from whence they came;* and the order of the names in the catalogue might lead us to think, that they were farther off from Jerusalem than Alexandria and Cyrenia, which will carry us to the proconsular province in Africa about Carthage.†

When Godwin mentions it as a Jewish tradition, that wheresoever there were ten men of Israel, there ought to be a synagogue built, he is somewhat mistaken in the meaning of the tradition, which was, that a synagogue ought to be built where there were ten בטלנים *battanim*, that is, men of leisure, who could take care of the affairs of the synagogue, and give themselves to the study of the law. So saith Lightfoot, understanding it to be a general name for the elders or officers of the synagogue.‡ However, others are of a different opinion; particularly Rhenferdius, who hath wrote a large dissertation, chiefly against Lightfoot, in order to prove that they were persons, who at a stated salary were obliged to attend the service of the synagogue at proper hours, that whoever came might find a sufficient number to make a lawful congregation, which the Jews imagine must consist, at least, of ten.§

In the synagogue, saith Godwin, the scribes ordinarily taught; but not only they, for Christ himself also taught in them. It is queried, by what right Christ and his apostles, who had no public character among the Jews, taught in their synagogues? In answer to which, Dr. Lightfoot observes, that though this liberty was allowed to no illiterate person or

* It is surprising that this opinion should be rejected by Mr. Selden, since he hath not only mentioned it, but quoted on the occasion the passages here produced out of Suidas, the Glossa Interlinearis, and the Acts of the Conference at Carthage. De Jure Nat. et Gent., ubi supra.

† See Dr. Lardner's Case of the Demoniacs, p. 152—156.

‡ Vid. Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. in Mat. iv. 23.

§ Vid. Rhenferdii Dissertationes Philolog. de Decem Otiosis Synagogæ, Franekræ, 1686, 4to.; Vitring. de Decemviris Otiosis, Franek. 1687, in defence of what he had advanced in his Archisynagog. Franeker. 1685, cap. ii. iii. et eundem de Synagog. Vetere, lib. ii. cap. vi.—viii., where he shows at large the grounds of Lightfoot's opinion, more fully than he had done himself, but leaves the dispute undetermined.

mechanic, but only to the learned; they nevertheless granted it to prophets, and workers of miracles, and such as set up for heads and leaders of new sects;* I suppose, in order that they might inform themselves of their dogmata, and not condemn them unheard and unknown. And under all these characters, Christ and his apostles were admitted to this privilege.

He that gave liberty to preach was termed Αρχισυναγωγος; which word is sometimes used in a larger sense, for any one of the officers who had power in the affairs of the synagogue. Thus in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts, ver. 15, we read of the Αρχισυναγωγοι, rulers of one synagogue. Sometimes it is used in a stricter sense, for the president or chief of those officers; as in the following passage of St. Luke: "And the ruler of the synagogue, Αρχισυναγωγος, answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the sabbath-day;" chap. xiii. 14. And perhaps in these passages of the Acts: "And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, Αρχισυναγωγος, believed on the Lord with all his house," chap. xviii. 8: again, "All the Greeks took Sosthenes, the chief ruler of the synagogue, Αρχισυναγωγος, and beat him before the judgment-seat;" ver. 17.

Next to the Αρχισυναγωγος was an officer, whose province it was to offer up public prayer to God for the whole congregation, and who on that account was called שליח צבור *sheliach zibbor*, the angel of the church,† because, as their messenger, he spoke to God for them. Hence the pastors of the seven churches of Asia, in the book of the Revelation, are called by a name borrowed from the synagogue, "angels of the churches." Dr. Lightfoot makes this officer to be the same with the Υπηρετης,‡ mentioned in the fourth chapter of St. Luke, and by our translators rendered "minister;" ver. 20. He also confounds it with the חזן *chazan*,§ as Vitringa did

* Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. in Matt. iv. 23, ad finem.

† Mish. Rosh Hasshanah, cap. iv. sect. ix.; Maimon. et Bartenor. in loc. tom. ii. p. 353, edit. Surenhus.; et Vitring. de Synag. Vetere, lib. iii. part ii. cap. i. p. 889—895, et cap. ii. p. 905, et seq.

‡ See his Harmony on Luke iv. 20.

§ See his Harmony on Luke iv. 15, sect. iv.

when he wrote his Archisynagogus,* but on maturer consideration he afterward altered his opinion.

The *chazan*, I apprehend, was, generally at least, a different officer from the *sheliach zibbor*, and inferior to him. Some understand the word *chazan* to answer to the Greek διακονος;† but according to the account the rabbies give of his office,‡ it should answer to the English word sexton; for he was the servant of the synagogue, as Dr. Doddridge on the forecited passage of St. Luke translates the word Ὑπηρετης, seeming to understand it, as most interpreters do, of the *chazan*.

The worship performed in the synagogue consisted of three parts,—reading the Scriptures, prayer, and preaching.

The Scriptures they read were the whole law of Moses, and portions out of the prophets, and hagiographa.

The law was divided into fifty-three, according to the Masorets, or, according to others, fifty-four פרשות *parashoth*, or sections. For the Jewish year consisted of twelve lunar months, alternately of twenty-nine or thirty days, that is, of fifty weeks and four days. The Jews, therefore, in their division of the law into *parashoth*, or sections, had a respect to their intercalary year, which was every second or third, and consisted of thirteen months; so that the whole law was read over this year, alloting one *parashah*, or section, to every sabbath. And in common years they reduced the fifty-three or fifty-four sections to the number of the fifty sabbaths, by reading two shorter ones together, as often as there was occasion. They began the course of reading the first sabbath after the feast of tabernacles; or rather, indeed, on the sabbath-day before that, when they finished the last course of reading, they also made a beginning of the new course;§ that so, as the rabbies say, the devil might not accuse them to God of being weary of reading his law.‖

* Archisynag. p. 58, et seq.

† Vitring. de Synag. Vetere, lib. iii. part. ii. cap. iv. p. 914, et seq.

‡ Vid. Mishn. Sotah, cap. vii. sect. vii.; Bartenor. et Wagenseil. in loc. tom. iii. p. 266, edit. Surenhus.; Vitring. de Synag. Vetere, ubi supra, cap. ii. p. 895, et seq.

§ See Vitringa de Synag. Vetere, lib. iii. part ii. cap. viii. p. 964, et seq.; Leusden. Philolog. Hebr. dissert. iv.

‖ Leusden, ubi supra, sect. xx.

The portions selected out of the prophets are called הפטרות *haphtaroth*. The tradition* is, that when Antiochus Epiphanes forbad them reading the law in their synagogues, they picked out portions of the prophets, somewhat answering in sense to those of the law,† and read them on the same days when the other should have been read.‡

The second part of the synagogue service was prayer. For the performance of which, saith Dr. Prideaux, they had liturgies, in which are all the prescribed forms of the synagogue worship. The most solemn part of these prayers are eighteen collects, which, according to the rabbies, were composed and instituted by Ezra, in order that the Jews, whose language after the captivity was corrupted with many barbarous terms, borrowed from other languages, might be able to perform their devotions in the pure language of their own country. This is the account which Maimonides gives out of the Gemara, of the origin of the Jewish liturgies.§ And the eighteen col-

* Elias Levita, in Thisbi ad Rad. פטר. See the passage quoted by Vitringa, de Synag. Vetere, lib. iii. part ii. cap. xi. p. 1006. This tradition of the origin of reading the haphtaroth is very improbable, as Vitringa shows, p. 1007, 1008.

† That the passages of the prophets were to be similar to those of the law we are informed by Maimonides de Precibus, cap. xiii. sect. iii.; see Vitring. p. 985, 986.

‡ See a table of the Parashoth and Haphtaroth in Maimon. de Ordine Precum in de Voisin. Observat. ad Raymundi Martini Pugionem Fidei, Proœm. p. 80, et seq. p. 108, et seq., or at the end of Athias's Hebrew Bible.

It is debated among learned men, whether the Greek version of the Septuagint was anciently used in the synagogues of those Jews who were not well versed in the Hebrew; or whether the original alone was read to them, and then interpreted. We have already declared our opinion, that the Hellenists, mentioned in the Acts, were Jews, who used the Greek version in sacris, or in their synagogues. See, on the other side of the question, Vitringa (de Synag. Vetere, lib. iii. part ii. cap. vii. p. 950—958), who hath laboured to prove, against Scaliger (Animadvers. ad Eusebii Chronicon, p. 134) and Walton (Prolegom. ix. sect. xiv. p. 60), that no Greek version was ever used in any Jewish synagogues. In support of the opinion we have espoused, besides Scaliger and Walton, see in particular, Hody de Bibliorum Textibus, lib. iii. part i. cap. i. p. 224—233.

§ Maimon. de Precibus et Benedict. Sacerdot. cap. i. sect. i.—ix. ex Gem. tit. Barachoth, fol. xxxiii. col. i.; et Megill. fol. xviii. col. ii.; see Vitringa, lib. i. part ii. cap. xii. p. 414—416.

lects, in particular, are mentioned in the Mishna.* However, some better evidence than that of the talmudical rabbies is requisite in order to prove their liturgies to be of so high an antiquity; especially when some of their prayers, as Dr. Prideaux acknowledges, seem to have been composed after the destruction of Jerusalem, and to have reference to it.† It is evident they were composed when there was no temple, nor sacrifices; since the seventeenth collect prays, that God would restore his worship to the inner part of his house, and make haste with fervour and love to accept the burnt sacrifices of Israel, &c.‡ They could not, therefore, be the composition of Ezra, who did not receive his commission from Artaxerxes to go to Judea till more than fifty years after the second temple was built, and its worship restored. However, Dr. Prideaux, not doubting but they were used, at least most of them, in our Saviour's time, and consequently that he joined in them,§ whenever he went into the synagogues, as he did every sabbath-day, Luke iv. 16, infers from hence two things, as he saith, for the consideration of Dissenters.

1st. "That our Saviour disliked not set forms of prayer in public worship."

2dly. "That he was content to join with the public in the meanest forms (for such he allows these Jewish forms to be)

* Mishn. tit. Barachoth, cap. iv. sect. iii. p. 14, edit. Surenhus.

† Connect. part i. book vi. vol. ii. p. 538, note d, 10th edit. 1729.

‡ Prideaux, ubi supra, p. 541, 542. The fifth, tenth, eleventh, and fourteenth collects have the same allusion and reference as the seventeenth. See the original prayers in Maimonides de Ordine Precum; or in Vitringa (de Synag. Vetere, lib. iii. part ii. cap. xiv. p. 1033—1038), who observes, that the Talmudists will have the seventeenth collect, which prays for the restoration of the temple worship (reduc ministerium Leviticum in Adytum Domus tuæ, as he translates it), to have been usually recited by the king in the temple at the feast of tabernacles; which is such an absurdity, that it confutes itself, and shows how little the Jewish traditions concerning the antiquity and use of their liturgies are to be depended upon.

§ Supposing these forms were used in our Saviour's time, it will not follow, that he joined in them, or worshipped God by them, because he frequently attended the Jewish synagogues; which he might do for other reasons. And indeed many of them, as the author of the Letter to Dr. Prideaux in the Occasional Paper (vol. iii. numb. iii. p. 14—17) justly observes and shows, were such as he cannot be supposed to have joined in, not being consistent with his character and circumstances.

rather than separate from it." "And this," says he, "may satisfy our Dissenters, that neither our using set forms of prayer in our public worship, nor the using of such forms as they think not sufficiently edifying, can be objection sufficient to justify them in their refusal to join with us in the use of them."*

As both these inferences are built upon the supposition, that forms of prayer were used in the Jewish church in our Saviour's time, if that cannot be satisfactorily proved, they stand upon a very precarious foundation. And though the Doctor is pleased to say there is no doubt of it, yet, unless he could produce some better and earlier evidence than the talmudical rabbies, I think there is great reason to withhold our assent. If they were in use so early as the Jewish writers pretend, it is strange there should be no hint of it in the Old Testament and in the Apocrypha; and if they came into use in or before our Saviour's time, some intimation of it might naturally have been expected in the New Testament. Nor is the total silence of Josephus and Philo, and all other writers previous to the talmudical rabbies, easy to be accounted for on supposition that such liturgical forms were then in use.

However, granting they were then used, and that our Saviour ordinarily attended the Jewish public worship, at that time very corrupt, and loaded with ceremonies of mere human invention; it may, nevertheless, be doubted how far his example in this case will oblige us to join with a national church in any forms of worship, which we apprehend to be corrupted from the divine institution: for,

1st. Though our blessed Saviour, for wise reasons, was present at the corrupt worship of the Jewish church, he frequently remonstrated against their corruptions. The argument, therefore, drawn from hence, for our complying with human inventions and corruptions in the worship of God, seems not quite remote from that which Cardinal Bellarmine uses for the worship of angels; "St. John fell down before an angel, in order to worship him; and why are we blamed for doing

* The same argument is used by Dr. Whitby on Luke iv. 16; by Archbishop Tillotson, serm. cxxxv. vol. iii. p. 227, fol.; by Dr. Bennet, in his Brief History of Forms of Prayer, chap. i.—iii., and by several others.

what St. John did?" To which Archbishop Tillotson properly replies, Because St. John was reproved by the angel for doing what he did. In like manner when we are asked, why we cannot comply with corrupt forms and human inventions, as Christ did?—we may reply, Because he remonstrated against such corrupt forms and human inventions, and reproved the Jews for them. Indeed, if this argument proves any thing, it proves too much; it proves that we must not only comply with corrupt modes and forms in divine worship, but that we must at the same time continue to bear our testimony against such corruptions; and this, we apprehend, would not only be disagreeable to our Christian brethren with whom we differ, but would ordinarily be the cause of more uncharitable contentions, and give a more mortal wound to the peace of the church, for the sake of preserving which the example of Christ is so strongly urged upon us, than a quiet and peaceable separation. Not to add,

2dly. That if we are under an obligation, from the example of Christ, to comply with the established worship in any nation, I apprehend we must be under the like obligation to comply with it in every nation, to be Episcopalians or Presbyterians, Papists or Protestants, according to the law and constitution of the country in which we reside.

3dly. Though our Saviour for a time complied with the corrupt worship of the Jewish church, he nevertheless afterward dissented, and set up another church, and another form, in opposition to theirs; enjoining on his disciples a nonconformity to the rites of the Jewish church, and a strict and close adherence to him as their lawgiver, and to his institutions as their rule, and not to suffer themselves to be again entangled with the yoke of carnal and ceremonial ordinances, but to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free; to own and submit to his authority alone as obligatory on conscience, and to oppose every usurpation on his sovereignty, and every invasion of the rights of his subjects. Which leads me to observe,

4thly. That the argument is built on this mistaken principle, that the Church of England is a national established church, on the same, or as good authority as the Jewish church was. That, indeed, was a divine establishment; and

all persons born in the land of Israel, and of Jewish parents, being considered as members of it, were therefore bound to conform to its rites and worship, at least so far as they were consonant to the divine institution. But is there a divine establishment of any national church under the gospel dispensation? If the New Testament gives us no other idea of the churches of Christ, but their being voluntary societies, uniting, under the laws of Christ, for public worship, and other purposes of religion; then is no man born a member of any church, but every one is at liberty to join himself to that, whose constitution and worship appear to him most agreeable to the rule of Scripture, and most for his own edification. And since the unity which the gospel recommends does not consist in the uniformity of rites and modes of worship, but in harmony of affection, and in the mutual love of all Christians; it follows, that the peace of the church is not broken by quiet and conscientious nonconformists, but by those who are bitter and violent against their fellow-christians for not approving those human forms of which they are fond and tenacious.*

The third part of their synagogue service was expounding the Scriptures, and preaching to the people. The posture in which this was performed, whether in the synagogue or other places (see Matt. v. 1, and Luke v. 3), was sitting. Accordingly, when our Saviour had read the הפטרות *haphtaroth*, in the synagogue at Nazareth, of which he was a member, having been brought up in that city; and then, instead of retiring to his place, sat down in the desk or pulpit, it is said, "the eyes of all that were present were fastened upon him," as they perceived by his posture that he was going to preach to them; Luke iv. 20. And when Paul and Barnabas went into the synagogue at Antioch, and sat down, thereby intimating their desire to speak to the people, if they might be permitted, the rulers of the synagogue sent to them, and gave them leave; Acts xiii. 14, 15.

* See Mr. Robinson's Review of the case of Liturgies, in answer to Dr. Bennet, chap. iii. p. 49, et seq.; and the Letter to Dr. Prideaux in the Occasional Paper, vol. iii. numb. iii.

If any are desirous of being acquainted with the Jewish forms, and with their manner of discharging the duty of public prayer, as described by the rabbies, they may have ample satisfaction in Vitringa, de Synag. Vetere, lib. iii. part ii. cap. xiii.—xviii., or in Buxtorf. de Synag. Judaicâ.

The synagogues were used, not only for divine service, but for holding courts of justice, especially upon ecclesiastical affairs. And as among us, lesser punishments are often inflicted in the court, as soon as judgment is given, for instance, burning in the hand; so among the Jews, the punishment of beating or whipping was often inflicted in the synagogue, while the court was sitting: see Matt. x. 17; Luke xii. 11; Acts xxii. 19.

To this use of the synagogues, for holding judiciary courts, Dr. Whitby thinks St. James refers, when he says, "If there come into your assembly, εις την συναγωγην ὑμων, a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment; and ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool; are ye not partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts," or judges who think and reason ill? James ii. 2—4. That the apostle here speaks of consistories for civil judicature is argued, 1st. From the use of the word συναγωγη, which never signifies in the New Testament an assembly of Christian worshippers. 2dly. From the word προσωποληψια being used to express the partiality here censured, in the clause immediately preceding: "My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons, εν ταις προσωποληψιαις," ver. 1. Now this term is most commonly, if not always, used for a partial respect of persons in judgment; like the instance here mentioned, favouring a rich man's cause before a poor man's. 3dly. The phrase "Sit thou under my footstool," ver. 3, most naturally refers to courts of justice; where the judge is commonly exalted upon a higher seat than the rest of the assembly; but it cannot be well applied to assemblies of worshippers. 4thly. The apostle's accusing them, on account of this conduct toward the poor, with being partial judges, ver. 4; and reminding them, that the rich were the persons who "drew them before the judgment-seats," ver. 6, seems very natural, if we understand him in the preceding passage as discoursing concerning courts of judicature. 5thly. The apostle says, such a respect of persons as he here speaks of, is contrary to the law, and those who are guilty of it are "convinced of the law as transgressors;" ver. 9. Now there

was no divine law against distinction of places in worshipping assemblies, into those which were more or less honourable; this must therefore, no doubt, refer to the law of partiality in judgment: "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment; thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honour the person of the mighty;" Lev. xix. 15: see also Deut. i. 17. The talmudists say,* it was a rule, that when "a poor man and a rich man pleaded together in judgment, the rich should not be bid to sit down, and the poor to stand; but either both shall sit, or both shall stand." To this rule, or custom, the apostle seems to refer, when he insinuates a charge against them, of saying to the rich man, "Sit thou here in a good place, and to the poor, Stand thou there;" James ii. 3.

So that, upon the whole, by the synagogue is not here meant, as is commonly understood, the church assembly for worship, but a court of judicature, in which men are too apt to favour the cause of the rich against the poor.

With respect to the schools amongst the Jews, it should be observed, that besides the common schools, in which children were taught to read the law, they had also academies, in which their doctors gave comments on the law, and taught the traditions to their pupils. Of this sort were the two famous schools of Hillel and Shammai, and the school of Gamalial, who was Paul's tutor; Acts xxii. 3. In these seminaries the tutor's chair is said to have been so much raised above the level of the floor, on which the pupils sat, that his feet were even with their heads. Hence St. Paul says, that "he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel." These academies were commonly furnished with several tutors, of whom one was president, and from whom the school was denominated. They were called בית-רבנין *beth-rabbonin;* whereas the inferior schools were called בית-רבן *beth-rabban,* as having only one master.

The doctors in these academies not only read lectures to their pupils, but held disputations or conferences, at which other persons might be present, and propose questions to them. It was perhaps in one of those schools, which were

* Vid. Hottinger. de Juris Hebræor. Legibus, leg. ccxlii. p. 364, edit. Tigur. 1655.

kept in some apartment in the courts of the temple, that Mary found her young son Jesus, "sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing and asking them questions;" Luke ii. 46. Or it might be even in the Sanhedrim, which, Dr. Lightfoot says, was the great school of the nation, as well as the great judicatory.*

In order to prove that these schools were different from the synagogues, Godwin observes, that Paul, having disputed for the space of three months in the synagogue, "because divers believed not, but spake evil of that way, then departed from them, and separated his disciples, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus;" Acts xix. 8—10. This argument is grounded on a supposition, that this school of Tyrannus was a Jewish academy; which is very unlikely, considering it was at Ephesus. Besides, it does not seem probable, that, on account of the Jews opposing and blaspheming the gospel, St. Paul should merely retire from a Jewish synagogue to a Jewish school. Was he likely to meet with less opposition amongst the same people by teaching in a different place? The truth seems to be, that he departed from the Jews, as being under obstinate and invincible prejudices, and taught among the Gentiles, in the school of one Tyrannus; and that for the space of two years: so that all the inhabitants of Asia heard the word of the Lord, Greeks as well as Jews. Some take Tyrannus to be the proper name of a Gentile philosopher, who favoured St. Paul, and lent him his school to preach and dispute in; others, to be a title or name of place or office, τυραννος signifying, in the Greek language, a king or prince; and accordingly the Chaldee Paraphrase, which often borrows words both from the Greek and Latin, renders the Hebrew word סרני *zarnè*, which we translate *lords* in the books of Joshua and Judges (Josh. xiii. 3; Judges xvi. 5. 8), by טורני *turnè*. Thus Phavorinus interprets τυραννος by αρχων πωλεως. It may, therefore, in this place signify a magistrate; which interpretation seems to be favoured by the addition of τινος. Nevertheless it must be owned, τινος is sometimes joined with a proper name; as τινα Σιμωνα, Mark xv. 21, and Τερτυλλου τινος, Acts xxiv. 1. However, if by τυραννου τινος we understand a certain magistrate of Ephesus, σχολη may signify his

* Lightfoot, Harmony on John iii. 10.

hall or gallery, in which people used to meet for discourse: a sense in which the word is very commonly used both by the Greeks and Latins. Others, again, take σχολη here to signify a γυμνασιον, in which wrestlers and other combatants in the public games exercised themselves; and which, perhaps, had been built at the expense of one Tyrannus, and therefore bore his name.*

With respect to their oratories, or προσευχαι, it is a question among the learned, whether they were different from their schools or synagogues. It is said, that our Saviour "went up into a mountain to pray, and continued all night," εν τη προσευχη του Θεου, which can hardly bear the sense our translators have put upon it, "in prayer to God;" Luke vi. 12. Beza indeed renders it, "pernoctavit illic, orans Deum;" but acknowledges he is forced to depart from the Greek, "ut planius loqueretur." But Dr. Whitby infers from the use of parallel phrases, such as "the mount of God," "the bread of God," "the altar of God," "the lamp of God," which are all of them things consecrated or appropriated to the service of God, that προσευχη του Θεου might in like manner signify "an oratory of God," or a place that was devoted to his service, especially for prayer. In the same sense he understands the word in the passage of the Acts, wherein we are informed, that Paul and his companions, on the sabbath-day, went out of the city by a river side, ου ενομιζετο προσευχη ειναι, which we render, "where prayer was wont to be made." But the Syriac renders it, "quoniam illic videbatur domus precationis;"—because there was perceived to be a house of prayer: and the Arabic, "ad locum quendam qui putabatur esse locus orationis;"—to a certain place, which was supposed to be a place of prayer: ου ενομιζετο, where there was taken, or feigned to be†—or where, according to received custom, there was‡—or where there was allowed by law,§—a proseucha, or oratory,

* Vid. Stephani Thesaurus in verb. Schola.

† Mede's Diatrib. disc. xviii. p. 67, of his Works. And De Dieu, Animadvers. in Acta xvi. 13.

‡ Elsner. Observ. Sacr. in loc., where he opposes Bos, who (in his Exercitat. Philolog. in loc.) had endeavoured to show, that ενομιζετο was redundant, and that the passage ought to be translated simply, "where there was a proseucha."

§ Lardner's Credibil. part i. vol. i. book i. cap. iii. sect. iii. p. 239,

and where, therefore, they expected to meet an assembly of people. Mr. Mede observes, that it should have been *ου ενομιζετο προσευχη γινεσθαι*, not *ειναι*, to express where prayer was wont to be made: and De Dieu seems to be of the same opinion.

That the Jews had houses, or places for prayer, called *προσευχαι*, appears from a variety of passages in Philo;* and particularly in his oration against Flaccus he complains, that their *προσευχαι* were pulled down, and there was no place left in which they might worship God and pray for Cæsar.† And Josephus, in his Life, mentions the proseuchæ more than once, and speaks of the people's being gathered *εις την προσευχην*.‡ To the same purpose is the following passage of Juvenal, if he be rightly understood by Godwin, Vitringa,§ and others :—

> Ede ubi consistas; in quâ te quæro Proseuchâ?
> Sat. iii. l. 296.||

3d edit. 1741. Erasmus Schmidius (in loc.) supports this sense of *ενομιζετο* by some passages in Aristophanes. Consult Scapula and Constantine in verb.

* Vid. in Flaccum, et Legat. ad Caium passim.

† Phil. in Flacc. apud Opera, p. 752, F, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

‡ Joseph. in Vit. sect. liv. et lvi. p. 27, tom. ii. edit. Haverc.

§ Vitring. de Synag. Vetere, lib. i. part i. cap. iv. p. 119.

|| The late learned Mr. Samuel Jones, of Tewkesbury, in his MS. Lectures on Godwin, hath the following note on this passage of Juvenal :—

"Autor noster et etiam Vitringa aliique poetam his verbis Synagogam Judæorum innuisse putant. Sed alitèr mihi videtur. Nam in hoc loco de Judæis nil habet; inducit verò Umbritium, Romanum quidem, non Judæum, de contumeliis, quibus pauperes afficiebant ebrii petulantesque juvenes, conquerentem, et referentem verba talium juvenum rogantium pauperem quendam, à quo conches et porra mendicasset, et quo in loco ad mendicandum stare assuetus erat. Quinetiam haud verisimile est Romanos mendicandi causâ synagogas frequentâsse, quum ipsi tunc temporis pauperrimi habebantur et mendici, ut ex hoc ipso aliisque constat poetis. Insuper quum poeta dicit; in quâ te quæro Proseuchâ? Innuit, quod plurimæ erant tunc temporis Romæ Proseuchæ. Non autem verisimile est plurimas ibi fuisse synagogas, quia Judæi tunc temporis pauperes erant et exosi et sæpe ab Imperatoribus longè ab urbe discedere jussi.

"Turnebus, ut hanc quæ autoris est sententiam probet, citat locum Cleomedis. Extat ille locus, lib. ii. p. 204, *Κυκλικης θεωριας μεθεωρων*, ubi Epicurum in suâ, de quâ gloriabatur, locutione vocibus corruptis, ridiculis et absurdis usum fuisse dicit; quarum quasdam perstringit, quasi *απο μεσης της*

Among those who make the synagogues and proseuchæ to be different places, are the learned Mr. Joseph Mede* and Dr. Prideaux;† and they think the difference consists, partly, in the form of the edifice; a synagogue, they say, being *ædificium tectum*, like our houses, or churches; and a proseucha being only encompassed with a wall, or some other mound or enclosure, and open at the top, like our courts.‡ They make them to differ in situation; synagogues being in towns and cities, proseuchæ in the fields, and frequently by the river side.§ Dr. Prideaux mentions another distinction, in respect

προσευχης και των επ' αυτης προαιτουντων Ιουδαικα τινα και παρακεχαραγμενα και κατα πολυ των ερπετων ταπεινοτερα. Sed de Synagogis Judæorum non videtur loqui. Tempore enim Epicuri, nempe circa Ptolomæi Philadelphi ætatem, lingua Græca in synagogis, dum precabantur, usos fuisse Judæos, haud verisimile est; et si usi fuissent, an eas Epicurus, homo gentilis et irreligiosus, frequentaret, ut inde verba depromeret? Et si ita fecisset, an necesse esset eæ voces essent corruptæ et humiles? Porro, quod non de synagogis, sed de locis ubi mendicantes stabant, egit, constare mihi videtur ex voce προαιτουντων, quæ non in synagogis precantibus, optimè verò alibi mendicantibus, convenit. Nec quicquam est hoc in loco, quod cujusquam in animum suspicionem induceret, Cleomedem de Judæis egisse, nissi sola vox Ιουδαικα. Sed ut ea vox hìc videtur absurda, et à contextu aliena, ita nullus dubito, quin corrupta est. In versione de Judæis ne verbum quidem; Ιουδαικα autem redditur 'vulgaria;' versionis igitur autor non legit Ιουδαικα, sed Ιδιωτικα, aut talem aliquam vocem. Eodem modo ex Ιδιων, Act. xxiv. 23, aliqui conflaverunt Ιουδαιων, ut in quibusdam editionibus extat, et ad locum notat Erasmus—Προσευχη ideo apud profanos hosce autores erat locus publicus, in quo pauperes stipem petebant."

* Ubi supra, p. 65, et seq.

† Connect. part i. book vi. vol. ii. p. 556, et seq. 10th edit.

‡ See the account which Epiphanius gives of the Jewish Proseuchæ, Hæres. lib. iii. tom. ii. hæres. lxxx. sect. i. Oper. vol. i. p. 1067, 1068, edit. Petav.

§ See a decree of the people of Halicarnassus, in favour of the Jews (Joseph. Antiq. lib. xiv. cap. x. sect. xxiii. p. 712, edit. Haverc.), in which are the following words—δεδοκται ήμιν Ιουδαιων τους βουλομενους—τας προσευχας ποιεσθαι προς τη θαλασση κατα το πατριον εθος. The custom of building proseuchæ by the water-side seems to have been derived from another custom of the Jews, namely, their washing before prayer (vid. Elsner. Observ. Sacr. in Acts xvi. 13), though De Dieu supposes it to be derived from the example of Isaac. There is a remarkable passage in Philo, which shows how fond the Jews were of praying by the sides of rivers, or on the sea-shore, Phil. in Flacc. p. 760, D, E, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613; see also de Vit. Mosis, lib. ii. p. 510, F; and Tertullian (ad Nationes, lib. i. cap.

to the service performed in them; in synagogues, he saith, the prayers were offered up in public forms in common for the whole congregation; but in the proseuchæ they prayed, as in the temple, every one apart for himself. And thus our Saviour prayed in the proseucha into which he entered.

Yet, after all, the proof in favour of this notion is not so strong, but that it still remains a question with some, whether the synagogues and the proseuchæ were any thing more than two different names for the same place; the one taken from the people's assembling in them, the other from the service to which they were more immediately appropriated; namely, prayer. Nevertheless, the name proseuchæ will not prove, that they were appropriated only to prayer, and therefore were different from synagogues, in which the Scriptures were also read, and expounded; since the temple, in which sacrifices were offered, and all the parts of divine service were performed, is called οικος προσευχης, a house of prayer; Matt. xxi. 13. And we find St. Paul preaching in the proseuchæ at Philippi, in the forecited passage of the Acts, chap xvi. 13. Dr. Prideaux acknowledges, that in our Saviour's time synagogues were called by the same name with the proseuchæ; and so both Josephus* and Philo† seem to use the word.‡ Mr. Mede lays great stress upon that passage in the book of Joshua, wherein he is said "to set up a pillar under an oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord," chap. xxiv. 26, to prove, that there were proseuchæ, even in Joshua's time, distinct from the tabernacle; arguing, that because the law expressly forbad planting trees near to God's altar, Deut. xvi. 21,

xiii. Oper. p. 50, edit. Rigalt.), among several Jewish rites, mentions Orationes litorales.

* See the passages before quoted from the Life of Josephus, where the proseucha, in which the people assembled in a great multitude, seems to have been the great synagogue at Tiberias.

† Philo speaks of many proseuchæ in the city of Alexandria: πολλαι δε (προσευκαι sc.) εισι καθ εκαστον τμημα της πολεως (Legat. ad Caium, p. 782, F); and of one in particular, which he styles μεγιστη και περισημοτατη (p. 783, A); and it was, no doubt, that very celebrated and magnificent synagogue of which the Jerusalem Talmud gives a very pompous description. Vid. Vitring. lib. i. part i. cap. xiv. p. 256.

‡ Vid. Vitring. de Synag. Vetere, lib. i. part i. cap. iv. p. 119—129; et Witsii Meletem. de Vit. Pauli, sect. v. vi. p. 70, 71.

therefore this sanctuary of the Lord by the oak could not be the tabernacle, which had the altar by it, but was one of the proseuchæ, which were very often inclosed with trees.* But Bishop Patrick observes, that though it was sinful to plant trees near to God's altar, it was not so to set up the sanctuary under or near the trees which had been planted before, especially when it was done only for a short time. And he farther remarks, that the words "by," or, as it may be rendered, in "the sanctuary of the Lord," do not necessarily refer to the oak, but may be connected with "the book of the law of God," mentioned in the former clause: "Joshua wrote these words in the book of the law of God (and took a great stone, and set it up under an oak), that was by, or in, the sanctuary of the Lord:" that is, he wrote these words in the book of the law of God, that was in the sanctuary of the Lord; the intermediate words being inserted in a parenthesis. There is a similar instance of a remote connexion in the following passage of the book of Genesis: "And Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered every where, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt, as thou comest unto Zoar," Gen. xiii. 10; where the connexion is, he "beheld all the plain of Jordan, as thou comest unto Zoar, that it was well watered every where," &c.

* Philo, Legat. ad Caium, p. 782, F, τας μεν (προσευκαι) εδενδροτομησαν.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE GATES OF JERUSALEM AND OF THE TEMPLE.

JERUSALEM, saith Godwin, had nine gates; or rather, according to the authors of the Universal History, ten; five from west to east-by-south, and five from west to east-by-north.

By south.	By north.
1. Dung-gate.	1. Valley-gate.
2. Fountain-gate.	2. Gate of Ephraim.
3. Water-gate.	3. Old-gate.
4. Horse-gate.	4. Fish-gate.
5. Prison-gate, or *miphkadh*.	5. Sheep-gate.

This account is very little, if any thing, different from the plan of the city prefixed to the Polyglot. But Hottinger, in his notes on Godwin,* hath given a very different description of the situation of these gates, which he endeavours to trace by the account of the order in which they were erected after the captivity, in the book of Nehemiah; where the sheep-gate is mentioned first, which he places on the west side of the city, and toward the south; principally for these two reasons; because he supposes it was the same with the gate which Josephus calls πυλη εσσηνων, that is, not the gate of the Essenes, it being improbable that a gate of the city, which must of course be common to all sorts of persons, should be called by the name of a particular sect; but the word Josephus uses is, he imagines, only the Hebrew word הצאן *hatsan, ovis,* with a Greek termination; and if so, πυλη εσσηνων, which Josephus saith was on the west side of the city, literally signifies the sheep-gate. Another reason for his assigning it this situation is, that the fish-gate, which is next mentioned in Nehemiah,

* Thomæ Godwini Moses et Aaron, &c. illustrati, emendati et præcipuis thematibus aucti, studio Joh. Henr. Hottingeri, p. 392, et seq. 2d edit. Francof. ad Mænum, 1716.

is placed by most on the west, with great probability, saith Hottinger, because large quantities of fish were brought into the city from that quarter; and because this situation seems to be assigned it in the following passage of the Second Book of Chronicles: "Now Manasseh built a wall without the city of David, on the west side of Gihon, in the valley, even to the entering in at the fish-gate." Thus, beginning at the south-west, he proceeds to the west, and so by the north, quite round the city; assigning the several gates their situation, according to the order in which they are mentioned in the sacred history.

Spanheim places the sheep-gate on the east,* Lightfoot on the south;† and in this, and several other respects, the topography of Jerusalem is a matter of great uncertainty.

Godwin informs us, that near the sheep-gate was situated the pool of Bethesda; επι τη προβατικη, saith the evangelist John, where our translators take the word αγορα to be understood, and accordingly have rendered it "by the sheep-market;" others, with Godwin, supply the noun πυλη, and render it "the sheep-gate;" which is the more probable sense, referring to the gate mentioned under this name by Nehemiah. And if this gate was situated near the temple, as is most commonly supposed, perhaps it was so called because the sheep and other cattle for sacrifice were usually drove in through it.

This pool of Bethesda demands our particular attention, on account of the miraculous cures which are ascribed to it in the Gospel of St. John, chap. v. 2—4. It is there called Κολυμβηθρα; a word, which, though it be rendered *piscina* by Beza and the Vulgate, yet does not properly signify a fish-pond, but rather a bath or pool for swimming, from κολυμβαω, *nato*. The Syriac therefore renders it, according to the Polyglot translation, *locus baptisterii*. Its proper name in the Hebrew or Syriac language was Bethesda; which Bochart,‡ Gomarus, and some others, derive from בית *beth, domus vel*

* Spanheim. Hierosol. Veteris Topograph. Descrip. p. 50, Oper. Geograph., &c. Lugd. Bat. 1701.

† Lightfoot's Harmony on John v. 2.

‡ Bochart. Geograph. lib. i. cap. xxxiv., Oper. tom. i. p. 614, edit. Lugd. Bat. 1707.

locus, and אשד *ashadh*, *effudit*. So that, according to this etymology, Βηθεσδα *est locus effusionis;* that is, as they conceive, either a reservoir for rain water, or a kind of cesspool, that received the waste water which run from the temple. Wagenseil* produces a passage from the Talmud, concerning a small stream issuing from the sanctuary, and proceeding to the gate of the city of David, by which time it was become so considerable, that persons in particular cases, especially women, used to bathe in it. And as he supposes the water daily used in the temple service, in washing the hands and feet of the priests, the victims, vessels, &c., was somewhere or other collected into a reservoir; if that was called the pool of Bethesda, he professes he should incline to explain the word by *effusionis domus*. But, on the whole, he declares himself uncertain.

Others, with greater probability, derive the word from בית *beth*, *domus*, and the Syriac חשדא *chesdo*, *gratia vel misericordia;* and so the name signifies the house or place of mercy, because of the miraculous healing virtue with which God mercifully endowed the water of that pool; and this is indeed the most extraordinary thing to be observed concerning it.

The evangelist says, that "an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water; whosoever then, first after the troubling the water, stepped in, was made whole of whatever disease he had;" and, therefore, there lay at this pool, in the five porticos that surrounded it (of which we have already taken some notice), "a multitude of impotent folk, as blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water." Now it is disputed, whether the virtue of these waters, and the cures performed by them, were miraculous or natural. Dr. Hammond contends for the latter, and imagines that the healing virtue of this bath was owing to the warm entrails of the victims being washed in it: that the angel, who is said to come and trouble the water, was only a messenger sent by the high-priest to stir up the bath, in order to mix the congealed blood, and other grosser particles that were sunk to the bottom, with the water, that so they might infuse their virtue into it more strongly. By κατα καιρον, which we render "at a certain season," he understands at a set time, that is, at

* Sotah, cap. i. sect. xlvii. annot. iv. p. 308.

one of the great feasts, when a vast multitude of sacrifices were killed and offered, and by that means the waters of this pool were impregnated with more healing virtue than they would have at other times. But this sense of the passage, in which Dr. Hammond thinks himself countenanced by the authority of Theophylact,* appears improbable from almost all the circumstances of the story.† As,

1st. From the healing virtue of this water extending to the cure of all manner of diseases. For it is said, "he that stepped in was made whole of whatever disease he had." Dr. Hammond indeed supposes, that "whatever disease he had," refers only to the three sorts of diseased persons before mentioned, namely, "the blind, lame, and withered." But that will not remove the objection, since no such healing virtue could ever be communicated to any other water by the same means, by washing the warm entrails of beasts in it, so as to render it effectual for the cure of all these diseases, or indeed of any one of them.

2dly. It is highly improbable, that the troubling or stirring up the water should increase its healing virtue; but rather, the stirring up the blood and fæces, that were sunk to the bottom, must make the bath so foul and fetid, that it would be more likely to poison than cure.

* An attentive reader of Theophylact's Commentary in loc. will easily perceive, that Dr. Hammond hath mistaken his meaning; for Theophylact never intended to assert that these miraculous cures were owing to the washing the entrails of the beasts slain for sacrifice in the waters of this pool, which thereby acquired, in a natural way, a sanative virtue. All he saith is, that by this washing the water was sanctified, and become thereby the more fit (for what? for healing diseases by any natural quality hereby imparted to it? no; but) for receiving *δυναμιν θειοτεραν*, a divine power, by the operation of the angel, who came to it, not as to common water, but as to chosen water, *ὑδατι ὡς εκλεκτω*, and wrought the miracle, *θαυματουργειν*. He says expressly, that the water did not heal by any virtue in itself, otherwise these cures would have been constant and perpetual; but solely through the energy, *ενεργεια*, of the angel, who imparted to it its healing virtue.

† See also an attempt to account for the virtue of these waters in a similar manner, from natural causes, in a tract published by Bartholine, a learned foreign physician, entitled, Paralytici Novi Testamenti medico et philologico Commentario illustrati; and republished in Crenius's Fasciculus Quintus, vid. p. 313—333, and p. 390—411.

3dly. No good reason can be given, on this supposition, why these medicinal waters should not have cured many persons as well as one only, the first that stepped in. The Doctor is indeed aware of this objection, and endeavours to evade it by supposing the bath might be so small, that it would hold but one at a time, and by the time one was cured, the healing particles were subsided, and therefore it could not heal another. But then, why could it not be stirred up a second time, and a third, and as many as there were persons to be cured? However,

4thly. The whole foundation of this supposition appears to be a mistake; namely, that the entrails of the victims were washed in this pool out of the temple; for Dr. Lightfoot shows that it was done in the temple, in the washing-room, as it was called, appointed for that purpose.* And, indeed, if this pool was near the sheep-gate, and if we suppose Hottinger's, or even Lightfoot's account of the situation of that gate to be true, it was then at too great a distance from the temple to be used as a washing-place for the entrails of the beasts slain for sacrifice.

Upon the whole, therefore, there is reason to conclude, that the healing virtue of this pool was miraculous; that the angel was a heavenly angel; and that the design and use of his coming was either to work the miracle, as God's instrument, by the use of the water; or, at least, by troubling the water, and giving it some unusual motion, to give notice to those who were waiting for a cure, when they might seek it.

It is farther inquired, when this miraculous pool first received its healing virtue? I take the most probable opinion to be, that it was about the time of, or not long before, our Saviour's coming; and very likely the chief intent of the miracle might be to give notice, by an illustrious type, of the speedy accomplishment of Zechariah's prophecy: "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness;" chap. xiii. 1. Thus the fountain of the blood of Christ to take away all sin, was afresh typified by the miraculous

* See Dr. Lightfoot's Description of the Temple, chap. xxxi.; and he supposes (Hor. Heb. John v. 2), that the pool of Bethesda was a bath, κολυμβηθρα, in which those who were unclean purified themselves.

virtue which God put into this pool to heal all manner of diseases. And as the fountain of Christ's blood was to be opened at the passover, at which feast he was crucified, so Dr. Lightfoot imagines, that the miraculous cure was effected by this pool at that feast only.*

It may seem a little strange, that there is no mention made of this miracle, either by Josephus, or the writers of the Talmud, who on all other occasions are ready enough to celebrate the miracles which God wrought for, and which did honour to, their nation. But supposing, which is highly probable, that the miraculous virtue was first imparted to this pool about the time of our Saviour's coming, and that it ceased at his death, whereby it plainly appeared that this miracle was wrought in honour of Christ, we need not wonder that Josephus passes it over in silence, since he could not relate it without reviving a testimony to Christ, greatly to the discredit of his own nation, who rejected and crucified him. And as it is not recorded by Josephus, it is not unlikely, that the memory of it was lost among the Jews at the time when the Talmud was written, which was not till several hundred years afterward.†

Concerning the gates of the temple, Godwin observes, that there were two of principal note, both built by Solomon; the one for those that were new married, the other for mourners and excommunicated persons. The mourners, he saith, were distinguished from the excommunicated by having their lips covered with a skirt of their garment; none entered that gate with their lips uncovered but such as were excommunicated. The Mishna saith, "All that enter, according to the custom of the temple, go in on the right-hand way, go round, and go out on the left-hand way; except a person, *cui accidit aliquid*, who is rendered unclean by a particular circumstance, who goes round and enters on the left. And being asked why he does so, if he answer, Because I mourn, they reply, He who inhabits this house comfort thee. If he answer, Because I

* Horæ Hebraic. John v. 4.

† There are two very learned dissertations on this subject in the second volume of the Thesaurus Novus Theologico Philologicus: one by Joan. Conrad. Hottingerus de Piscinâ Bethesda; the other by David Ebersbach, de Miraculo Piscinæ Bethesdæ. The last contains a full reply both to Bartholine and Hammond. See also Witsii Miscell. tom. ii. exercitat. xi. sect. liv.—lx. p. 314—320.

am excommunicated, the reply is, according to R. Jose, He who inhabits this house put it into thy heart to hearken to the words of thy companions, or brethren, that they may receive thee."* It appears from hence (at least according to the opinion of the mishnical rabbies), that excommunicated persons were not excluded from the temple, though they were from the synagogue, as we learn from several passages in the evangelist John, chap. ix. 22; xii. 42; xvi. 2; where such persons are said to be *αποσυναγωγοι*, excluded from the synagogue. Not that we are to infer from this, that the Jews accounted their synagogues more holy than the temple; but it shows what was, and should be, the true intent of excommunication, namely, the shaming and humbling an offender, in order to bring him to repentance; on which account he was excluded the society of his neighbours in the synagogue; but not his eternal destruction, by driving him from the presence of God in the temple, and depriving him of the use of the most solemn ordinances, and the most effectual means of grace and salvation. The temple was the common place of worship for Israelites; by allowing him to come thither they signified, that they did not exclude him from the common privilege of an Israelite, though they would not receive him into their familiarity and friendship. How much heavier is the yoke of antichrist than the Jewish yoke of bondage! How much more cruel is the excommunication of Popery, which deprives persons of all their liberties and privileges, of their goods and lives, and consigns over their souls to be tormented in hell for ever,—how infinitely more cruel, I say, is this modern excommunication than even that of the wicked and barbarous Jews, who crucified the Lord of glory!

* Mish. tit. Middoth. cap. ii. sect. ii.; et Maimon. in loc. tom. v. p. 334, 335, edit. Surenhus.; Lightf. Hor. Hebr. 1 Cor. v. 5.

CHAPTER IV.

OF THEIR GROVES AND HIGH PLACES.

We have several times had occasion to observe, that in order the more effectually to guard the Israelites from idolatry, the blessed God, in instituting the rites of his own worship, went directly counter to the practice of the idolatrous nations. Thus, because they worshipped in groves,* he expressly forbad "the planting a grove of trees near his altar;" Deut. xvi. 21.† Nor would he suffer his people to offer their sacrifices on the tops of hills and mountains, as the heathens did,‡ but ordered that they should be brought to one altar in the place which he appointed; Deut. xii. 13, 14. And as for the groves,

* Hæc (nemora sc.) fuere numinum templa, priscoque ritu simplicia rura Deo præcellentem arborem dicant. Nec magis auro fulgentia atque ebore simulacra quam lucos et ipsa silentia adoramus. Plin. Nat. Hist. lib. xii. cap. i. p. 4, tom. iii. edit. Harduin. 1685. See also Lucian. de Sacrif. tom. i. p. 355, C, D, edit. Salmur. 1619. These groves Plutarch calls *αλση θεων*, the groves of the gods, which he saith Numa frequented, and thereby gave occasion to the story of his commerce with the goddess Egeria; Plutarc. in Numa, p. 61, F, Oper. tom. i. edit. Francof. 1620. They are expressly enjoined, by the laws of the twelve tables, as a part of the public religion, Lucos in agris habento. Vid. Duodecim. Tabular. Fragm. tit. Ubi colendi ad calcem Cod. Justiniani, p. 751, apud Corp. Juris Civil. edit. Lips. 1720.

† See Spencer's learned dissertation on this and the following verse, de Leg. Hebræor. lib. ii. cap. xxvii. xxviii.

‡ Sophocles introduces Hercules asking Hyllus, whether he knew Mount Œta, which was sacred to Jupiter? "Yes," saith he, "for I have often sacrificed upon the top of it." Trachin. v. 1207, 1208, tom. ii. p. 325, edit. Glasg. 1745. And Strabo saith of the Persians, *αγαλματα και βωμους ουκ ιδρυονται, θυουσι δε εν ὑψηλω τοπω τον ουρανον ηγουμενοι Δια*; Geograph. lib. xv. p. 732, C, edit. Casaub. 1620. See also Herodot. Clio, cap. cxxxi. p. 55, sect. 131, edit. Gronov.; Xenophon. Cyr. lib. viii. p. 500, 3d edit. Hutchins; and Appian (de Bello Mithrad. p. 361, 362, sect. ccxv., edit. Tollii, Amstel. 1670) saith, that Mithridates sacrificed to Jupiter according to the custom of his country, *επι ορους ὑψηλου*, upon a high mountain.

which the Canaanites had planted, and the idols and altars which they had erected on the tops of high mountains and hills for the worship of their gods, the Israelites are commanded utterly to destroy them; ver. 2, 3.

The groves and high places do not seem to have been different, but the same places, or groves planted on the tops of hills, probably round an open area, in which the idolatrous worship was performed, as may be inferred from the following words of the prophet Hosea: "They sacrifice upon the tops of mountains, and burn incense upon the hills, under oaks, and poplars, and elms;" chap. iv. 13. The use of groves for religious worship is generally supposed to have been as ancient as the patriarchal ages; for we are informed, that "Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, and called there on the name of the Lord;" Gen. xxi. 33. However, it is not expressly said, nor can it by this passage be proved, that he planted the grove for any religious purpose; it might only be designed to shade his tent. And this circumstance perhaps is recorded to intimate his rural way of living, as well as his religious character; that he dwelt in a tent, under the shade of a grove, or tree, as the word אשל *eshel*, may more properly be translated; and in this humble habitation led a very pious and devout life.

The reason and origin of planting sacred groves is variously conjectured; some imagining it was only hereby intended to render the service more agreeable to the worshippers, by the pleasantness of the shade;* whereas others suppose it was to invite the presence of the gods. The one or the other of these reasons seems to be intimated in the forecited passage of Hosea, "They burn incense under oaks, and poplars, and elms, because the shade thereof is good;" chap. iv. 13. Others conceive their worship was performed in the midst of groves, because the gloom of such a place is apt to strike a religious awe upon the mind;† or else, because such dark conceal-

* This seems, according to Virgil, to have been the reason of Dido's building the temple of Juno in a delightful grove:

Lucus in urbe fuit mediâ, lætissimus umbrâ:
Hic templum Junoni ingens Sidonia Dido
Condebat. Æneid, lib. i. v. 445.

† "Si tibi occurrit," saith Seneca, Epist. xli. "vetustis arboribus, et solitam altitudinem egressis frequens lucus, et conspectum cœli densitate

ments suited the lewd mysteries of their idolatrous worship.*

I have met with another conjecture, which seems as probable as any, that this practice began with the worship of demons, or departed souls. It was an ancient custom to bury the dead under trees, or in woods. "Deborah was buried under an oak, near Bethel," Gen. xxxv. 8; and the bones of Saul and Jonathan under a tree at Jabesh; 1 Sam. xxxi. 13. Now an imagination prevailing among the heathen, that the souls of the deceased hover about their graves, or at least delight to visit their dead bodies, the idolaters, who paid divine honours to the souls of their departed heroes, erected images and altars for their worship in the same groves where they were buried;† and from thence it grew into a custom afterward to plant groves, and build temples, near the tombs of departed heroes, 2 Kings xxiii. 15, 16;‡ and to surround their temples and altars with groves and trees;§ and these

ramorum aliorum alios protegentium submovens: illa proceritas sylvæ, et secretum loci et admiratio umbræ, in aperto tam densæ atque continuæ, fidem tibi numinis facit. Et siquis specus saxis penitus exesis montem suspenderit, non manufactus, sed naturalibus causis in tantam laxitatem excavatus: animum tuum quadam religionis suspicione percutiet." See also a remarkable passage in Virgil, Æneid, viii. v. 347, et seq.

* For proof of the lewdness and obscenity of many of the religious rites of the heathen, vid. Herodot. Euterp. cap. lxiv. p. 112, 113, edit. Gronov. et Clio, sect. cxcix. p. 80; Diodor. Sicul. lib. iv. init.; Valer. Maxim. lib. ii. cap. vi. sect. xv. p. 185, 186, edit. Thysii. Lugd. Bat. 1655; Juvenal, sat. ix. v. 24; and what Eusebius saith of a grove on Mount Libanus, dedicated to Venus, in his Life of Constantine, lib. iii. cap. lv. Compare 1 Kings xiv. 23, 24.

† Plato, after having declared his approbation of the sentiment of Hesiod, that when any of the golden age died they became demons, and the authors of great good to mankind; and after having asserted, that all who died bravely in war were entitled to be ranked in the same class, reckons, among the honours they deserved, their sepulchres being esteemed and worshipped as the repositories of demons—ὡς δαιμονον ὀντω θεραπευσομεν τε και προσκυνησομεν αυτων τας θηκας. De Republ. lib. v. p. 662, D, E, edit. Ficin. Francofurt. 1602.

‡ See Arrian's description of the tomb of Cyrus, de Expedit. Alexandr. lib. vi. p. 435, edit. Blancard. Amstel. 1678.

§ On account of the custom of planting trees near temples, "the poets," as Strabo informs us, "styled all their temples groves, even those which had no plantations around them." Geograph. lib. ix. p. 412, D, edit. Casaub. 1620.

sacred groves being constantly furnished with the images of the heroes or gods that were worshipped in them, a grove and an idol came to be used as convertible terms; 2 Kings xxiii. 6.

We have before observed, that these sacred groves were usually planted on the tops of hills or mountains, from whence they are called in Scripture במות *bamoth*, or "high places." Perhaps such an exalted situation was chosen by idolaters, in respect to their chief god, the sun, whom they worshipped, together with their inferior deities, on the tops of hills and mountains, that they might approach as near to him as they could.* It is no improbable conjecture concerning the Egyptian pyramids, that they were intended as altars to the sun, as well as very likely for sepulchral monuments, like these ancient groves. Accordingly, they are all flat at the top, to serve the purposes of an altar. It is said, that altars to the sun, of the same form, though not so large as the pyramids, were found among the American idolaters.†

There might be another reason for planting the sacred groves on the tops of hills and mountains; namely, for the sake of retirement from noise and disturbance in their acts of worship.‡ And on this account, probably, the worshippers of the true God had also their proseuchæ, or places of retirement for worship, generally on hills or high places. Accordingly we read, that Christ "went up into a mountain apart to pray;" Matt. xiv. 23. And at his transfiguration he retired with three of his "disciples, to the top of a high mountain apart;" chap. xvii. 1. I see no reason, therefore, to conclude, that those high places, of which we read in the Old Testament, where holy men and worshippers of the true God paid their devotion, were the sacred groves of the idolaters, but rather they were Jewish proseuchæ, or synagogues. Such were the high places by the city where Samuel lived, and where he sacrificed with the people, 1 Sam. ix. 12—14; and upon the

* Tacitus speaks of some places, which were thought "maximè cœlo propinquare, precesque mortalium à Deo nusquam proprius audiri." Annal. lib. xiii. sect. lvii. p. 281, edit. Glasg. 1743.

† See Young's Historical Dissertation on Idolatrous Corruptions in Religion, vol. i. p. 222—228.

‡ "Lucos et ipsa silentia adoramus," saith Pliny, in a passage before cited.

hill of Gath, where was either a school of the prophets, or they had been thither to pay their devotion when Saul met them; see 1 Sam. x. 5—13. And of the same sort was the great high place at Gibeon, where Solomon sacrificed, and where God appeared to him in a dream; 1 Kings iii. 4, 5.

The grand difficulty on this head is how to reconcile their sacrificing in other places beside the national altar, as Gideon did at Ophrah, Judges vi. 24; Manoah in the country of Dan, chap. xiii. 16—20; Samuel at Mizpah, 1 Sam. vii. 10, and at Bethlehem, chap. xvi. 5; David in the threshing-floor of Ornan, 1 Chron. xxi. 22; and Elijah on Mount Carmel, 1 Kings xviii. 30, *et seq.*,—with the law in the book of Deuteronomy, "Take heed to thyself, that thou offer not thy burnt-offerings in every place that thou seest. But in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, there thou shalt offer thy burnt-offerings, and there thou shalt do all that I commanded thee;" chap. xii. 13, 14.

The best solution, I apprehend, is, that it was done by special divine direction and command, God having an undoubted right to supersede his own positive laws, when and in what cases he pleases; and as this is expressly asserted to have been done in David's case before mentioned, 1 Chron. xxi. 18, it may the more reasonably be supposed in all the rest.

This may intimate to us the true solution of another difficulty, how to reconcile the law which prescribes an altar "of earth only to be made in all places where God should record his name," Exod. xx. 24, with the order which Moses received to make a brazen altar in the court of the tabernacle.

Some have supposed, that the brazen altar was filled with earth and stones, and so was an altar of earth, though cased with brass. But the real solution I take to be this: "In all places where I record my name," means, in whatever particular place, beside the national altar, I shall cause my name to be recorded, by commanding my servants to sacrifice unto me, there thou shalt make an altar of earth.

The reason of God's appointing such plain and inartificial altars, on these special occasions, was in all likelihood to prevent that superstitious veneration which the people would probably have entertained for them, as having a more than ordi-

nary sanctity in them, if they had been more expensive and durable; whereas being raised just to serve a present exigence, and presently pulled down, or falling of themselves, they could not administer any temptation to superstition or idolatry.

But to return: Though some places were called by the name of high places, which had never been polluted with heathen idolatry, and in which God was acceptably worshipped, nevertheless, all which had been actually so defiled the Israelites are commanded utterly to destroy; insomuch, that it is left upon record, as a stain and blemish upon the character of some of the more pious kings of Judah, that they did not destroy them, but suffered the people, who were very prone to idolatry, to sacrifice in them: which is the case of Asa, 1 Kings xv 14; Jehoshaphat, chap. xxii. 43; and several others.

CHAPTER V.

OF THE CITIES OF REFUGE.

The Latin word asylum, used for a sanctuary, or place of refuge, has so near an affinity with the Hebrew word אשל *eshel*, a tree or grove, as to make it probable, that the sacred groves, which we spoke of in the last chapter, were the ancient places of refuge, and that the Romans derived the use of them from the eastern nations. So we find in Virgil, that the *asyla* were groves :*

> Hinc lucum ingentem quem Romulus acer asylum
> Rettulit. Æneid, viii. l. 342.

And God's altar appears to have been the asylum of the Jews, before the cities of refuge were appointed ; Exod. xxi. 14. Some persons have imagined, that all the cities of the Levites, in number forty-two, were *asyla*. But that appears to be a mistake ; for in the book of Numbers, chap. xxxv. 6, among the cities that were given to the Levites, only six are mentioned as appointed to be cities of refuge.

These *asyla* were not only intended for Jews, but for Gentiles, or for strangers, who dwelt among them ; ver. 15.

They were not designed as sanctuaries for wilful murderers,

* Mr. Jones supposes, that the reason why these groves were considered as places of refuge, was the opinion which prevailed, that the demons, to whom they were dedicated, afforded their assistance to those who fled to them for protection. "Asylorum origo mihi deducenda videtur ex antiquorum erga mortuos reverentia, et opinione eorum potentiæ opem ferendi supplicibus. Illi, qui à potentioribus metuebant, ad sepulcra virorum eximiorum confugiebant." Vid. Senecam in Troad. act iii. Ita Plutarchus Thesei sepulcrum fuisse asylum dicit in vitâ Thesei, sub fin. He observes, that God never appointed his altar for an asylum; nevertheless, it was so considered before the giving of the law in Exodus concerning the cities of refuge. On which account he imagines, that the origin of asyla was not a divine institution, but that God, by his appointment of cities of refuge, perhaps intended to check and restrain the superstitious and idolatrous use of groves and altars for this purpose. Annot. MS. in Godwini Mos. et Aaron.

and all kinds of atrocious villains among the Jews, as they were among the Greeks and Romans,* and now are in Roman Catholic countries,† but merely for securing those who had been guilty of involuntary homicide, Deut. xix. 4—10, from the effects of private revenge, until they were cleared by a legal process. And it is observable, that the Israelites are commanded to "prepare the way," that is, to make the road good, "that every slayer may flee thither" without impediment, and with all expedition; ver. 3. And, as Godwin observes, the rabbies inform us, among other circumstances, that at every cross road was set up an inscription, Asylum! Asylum! Upon which Hottinger remarks, that it was probably in allusion to this custom that John the Baptist is described as "the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight;" Luke iii. 4—6. He was the Messiah's forerunner, and in that character was to remove the obstacles to men's flying to him as their asylum, and obtaining, σωτηριον του Θεου, the salvation of God.

For any thing farther on this subject we refer to Godwin's Moses and Aaron, especially with Hottinger's notes.

* Privilegia asylorum, inquit Jonesius, summa erant, certa enim in illis supplicibus salus, nec ullus inde sub quovis prætextu ad pœnum extrahendus, δεδωκασι γαρ δε αδειαν εντανθα ικετευουσι. Pausan. lib. ii. p. 108, l. 45, edit. Xyland. Hanov. 1613. Nec de eo qui in asylum confugerat, judicium instituebant, nec examinabant, an talis vitæ dignus erat, an non. Eum verò Diis relinquendum censebant. Ita Leotycidam, quamvis proditionis reum, nunquam extrahere conati sunt Lacedæmonii. Pausan. lib. iii. p. 171, l. 44, et seq. Ita Livius, lib. xliv. cap. xxix. Sanctitas templi insulæque inviolatos præstabat omnes. Et idem de cujuslibet generis maleficis, quinetiam obæratis, testatur Tacitus; Annal. lib. iii. cap. lx. Verum est quod aliqui aliquando hæc violârunt privilegia; sed ii habebantur hominum scelestissimi, nec à pœnâ ab hominibus erant liberi, nisi nimia eos tuebatur potentia. Vid. Thucyd. lib. i. sect. cxxvi. p. 69, 70, et sect. cxxxiv. p. 174, 175, edit. Hudson. Saltem verò violatorum horum privilegiorum acerrimi, vindices habebantur Dii. Vid. Justin. lib. viii. cap. i. ii.; Pausan. lib. i. p. 36, l. 20, et seq.; et lib. vii. p. 445, l. 50, et seq. p. 447, l. 37, edit. Xyland. Hanov. 1613.

† Middleton's Letter from Rome, p. 156—158, of his Miscellan. Works, vol. v. octavo.

JEWISH ANTIQUITIES.

BOOK III.

CONCERNING TIMES.

JEWISH ANTIQUITIES.

CHAPTER I.

OF DAYS, HOURS, WEEKS, AND YEARS.

THE Hebrews, in common with other nations, distinguished their days into natural, consisting of twenty-four hours; and artificial, that is, from sun-rise to sun-set.

Concerning the natural day, it is inquired when it began and ended.

Godwin conceives the ancient Jews had two different beginnings of the natural day; one of the sacred or festival day, which was in the evening; the other of the civil or working day, which was in the morning. That the sacred day began in the evening is certain from the following passage of Leviticus: "From even unto even shall ye celebrate your sabbaths," chap. xxiii. 32; and also from the following words in the book of Exodus: "In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at even, ye shall eat unleavened bread, until the one and twentieth day of the month at even;" chap. xii. 18. Nevertheless, the passage which our author alleges out of the evangelist Matthew, "In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week," chap. xxviii. 1, does not so certainly prove, that the civil, natural day began in the morning. For "the first day of the week" may there be understood of the artificial day; as indeed the word επιφωσκουσῃ* seems to imply. In like manner, though we begin the natural day at midnight, yet we speak of the day breaking or dawning a little before sun-rise. That the Jews began the day, not at evening, but at midnight, or in the morning, at the time of their migration out of Egypt, appears

* See on this word Dr. Macknight's Commentary in loc.

from hence, that the fifteenth day of the month, in which they departed from Egypt, is said to be the morrow after the passover, which was kept on the fourteenth day in the evening; Numb. xxxiii. 3, compared with Exod. xii. 6. But neither will this prove, that they reckoned the beginning of their civil and sacred day from a different epocha. It is more probable, that, before their departure out of Egypt, they began all their days, both civil and sacred, with the sun's rising, as the ancient Babylonians, Persians, Syrians, and most of the eastern nations did.* And, at the time of their migration, God ordered them to change the beginning, not only of the year and of the week, but likewise of the day, from the morning to the evening, in opposition to the customs of the idolatrous nations, who, in honour to their chief god, the sun, began their day at his rising.

Cocceius, who supposes, that only the sacred day began in the evening, finds out this mystery in it, that God appointed the sabbath of the Jewish church to begin with the night, in order to signify the darkness of that dispensation, compared with the subsequent one of the gospel; the light of divine knowledge being in those times like that of the moon and stars in the night, but under the Christian dispensation, like that of the sun in the day.†

It has been commonly supposed, that the epocha, or beginning, of the natural day was originally in the evening; "The evening and the morning," saith Moses in the book of Genesis, "were the first day;" chap. i. 5. And if so, we are to conclude, that the idolaters had changed the beginning of the day to the morning, in honour of the sun; and that God restored it, by the law which he gave to the Jews, to its original epocha. But learned men are not agreed about the meaning of this passage, and the reason of Moses's setting the evening before the morning. Le Clerc‡ begins the first day from the creation of the chaos, and by the evening he understands all the time it remained in darkness, before the production of light. But this opinion does not well agree with the import of the Hebrew word עֶרֶב *gnerebh*, the evening,

* Petav. de Doctrinâ Temporum, lib. vii. p. 609.

† Vid. Cocceii Comment. in Lev. xxiii. sect. xviii. Oper. tom. i. p. 173.

‡ In loc.

from עָרַב *gnarabh, miscuit;* which therefore denotes twilight, in which there is a kind of mixture of light and darkness; rather than total darkness, such as there was before light was produced.

Others think it more natural to date the beginning of time, and the succession of day and night, from the first production of light. But as for the reason of Moses's setting the evening before the morning, the most probable opinions are those of Cocceius and Lyra. Cocceius understands the words in the following manner, that the light moved away from the place or hemisphere, on which it first appeared, and was succeeded by darkness; and when it returned to enlighten the same hemisphere again, the first day was completed.* So that, according to him, the evening signifies the light moving away, which it began to do from its first appearance.

The other opinion is, that the two parts of the natural day, namely, the artificial day and artificial night, are denominated from the terms which complete them, from the evening, which is the end of the day, and from the morning, which is the end of the night; and so the evening and the morning make up one natural day; namely, from morning to morning.†

But whatever were the reasons of Moses's setting the evening before the morning, or the night before the day, his expression has plainly been followed by other writers, and in other languages. Hence days are expressed in the book of Daniel by ערב-בקר *gnerebh-boker*, evening and morning; chap. viii. 14. Hence also is the use of the Greek word *νυχθημερον*; 2 Cor. xi. 25. And may we not observe some faint traces of the same original in the English language, in our computing time by nights rather than by days; as, in the words sennight, fortnight, &c.?

With respect to the artificial day and night, I observe, that the Hebrews divided the night into four watches, as appears from St. Matthew, who speaks of the fourth watch of the night, chap. xiv. 25; and from St. Mark, who styles these watches, the even, midnight, cockcrowing, and the morning; chap. xiii. 35. Nevertheless, it should seem that they anciently divided the night into an odd number of watches, pro-

* Vid. Cocceii Cur. prior. in Gen. i. 5.

† Vid. Lyr. apud Poli Synops. in loc.

bably into three; since we read in the book of Judges, of "the middle watch;" chap. vii. 19.

It is probable these watches had their rise, and their name, from the watchmen who kept guard at the gates of the city and of the temple by night, and who relieved one another by turns. And if anciently there were but three watches, then each watched four hours; and more in the winter, when the nights are above twelve long. But that being found too tedious and tiresome, the number of watches was afterward increased to four. We, therefore, never read of the middle watch in the New Testament.

The day was divided into hours; which are reckoned to be of two sorts, less and greater. The lesser hours were twelve, as appears from the following question in the evangelist John, "Are there not twelve hours in the day?" chap. xi. 9. Each of these was a twelfth part of the artificial day. Herodotus observes, that the Greeks learned from the Babylonians, among other things, the method of dividing the day into twelve parts. But whether the Hebrews derived it from the Babylonians, or the Babylonians from the Hebrews, cannot now be known.* Nor does it appear how ancient this division of the day into hours, among the Hebrews, was. The first hint in Scripture, which seems to imply such a division, is a passage in the Second Book of Kings, chap. xx. 9—11, where we read of the shadow's going back twenty degrees on the sun-dial of Ahaz. But the history gives us no intimation what those degrees were, or what portion of time was marked by them.

The mention of this dial suggests a question which has occasioned much dispute among the learned: Whether the miracle of the shadow's going back was wrought upon the sun, or only upon the dial? Vatablus, Montanus, and several moderns observe, that there is not a word said of the sun's going back, but only of the shadow upon the dial; which might be effected by the divine power, perhaps by the ministry of angels, obstructing or refracting the rays of the sun, or altering the position of the dial, so as to make the shadow retire without changing the motion of the sun itself. The

* Herodot. Euterp. cap. cix. p. 127, edit Gronov.

Jews, in general, are of the contrary opinion, with which Archbishop Usher agrees; who says, that the sun and all the heavenly bodies went back, and as much was detracted from the next night as was added to this day.*

The arguments on this side of the question are,

1st. The words of Isaiah, chap. xxxviii. 8, that "the sun returned ten degrees." But this may possibly be meant only of its shadow, especially in so poetical a writer as Isaiah.

2dly. That the miracle was observed at Babylon, from whence Meradach-Baladan sent to inquire about it, 2 Chron. xxxii. 31; which could not have been the case, unless it had been wrought on the sun itself, and not merely on the dial of Ahaz. To this it is answered, that it does not appear the miracle was observed at Babylon; rather the contrary. For it is said, "The princes of Babylon sent to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land;" not as a thing they themselves had seen in their own country, which must have been the case, if the miracle had been wrought on the sun; but which they had heard reported as done in the land of Israel.†

To return to our subject: the first mention we have of hours in the Old Testament is in the book of Daniel, particularly in the fourth chapter; where Daniel, upon hearing Nebuchadnezzar's dream, is said to have been astonished for one hour, ver. 19, שעה *shangnah*. But that word is of too general a signification to prove that hours, in the modern sense of the term, were then in use; it seems rather to import any portion of time; and perhaps, in the decree of Nebuchadnezzar, that all who refused to worship his image should be cast into the fiery furnace, it might as well be rendered that minute or moment, as "the same hour;" chap. iii. 15. And, in the present case, it is not very likely, that a poor Jewish slave, as Daniel was, should stand as one stupid, a whole hour, in the presence of so great a monarch as Nebuchadnezzar. On the whole, I do not find that the antiquity of the Jewish hours can be traced and ascertained by any thing that is said in the Old Testament.

* Usser. Annal. A. M. 4001.

† Vossius de Origine et Progressu Idololatriæ, lib. ii. cap. ix. p. 179, Amstel. 1668.

Besides the twelve lesser hours (which, as they are supposed to be equal divisions of the artificial day, must be of different lengths at different times of the year, and which are the same that we now call Jewish hours), Godwin, with many others, speaks of the greater hours; which are said to be four, each containing three of the lesser hours; the first beginning at sun-rise (and not at six o'clock, as Godwin erroneously says), and holding till about nine. The second ended at noon, the third in the middle of the afternoon, and the fourth at sun-set. However, this division of the day into greater hours is not sufficiently supported by the passages of Scripture which Godwin quotes in proof of it. And several learned men, very skilful in these matters, have doubted whether any such hours were in use among the Jews.

Mayer* thinks he has proved, that the greater hours were in use in the days of Nehemiah, from the following passage: "They read in the book of the law one fourth part of the day, and another fourth part they confessed and worshipped the Lord their God;" chap. ix. 3. This, however, will prove no more, than that they had skill enough, in those times, to divide the day, upon occasion, into four parts; but that these divisions were called the greater hours, or that this was a stated division of the day, does not appear.

Since, then, the use of the greater hours is so uncertain, even in our Saviour's time, we must not rely on them, as Godwin does, for reconciling the different accounts of the evangelists, concerning the time of our Lord's crucifixion. St. Mark says it was at the third hour, chap. xv. 25; whereas, according to St. John, chap. xix. 14, it was about the sixth hour when he was arraigned before Pilate. Some endeavour to remove this difficulty by the supposition, that St. John's Gospel was written after the destruction of Jerusalem,† and that he therefore uses the computation of the Romans, who began the natural day, as we do, from twelve o'clock at night; accordingly the sixth hour, when Pilate condemned Christ to

* Johannis Mayeri Tractat. de Temporibus et Festis Diebus Hebræor. part i. cap. x. sect. xiv.—xvii. p. 68—70, 2d edit. Amstel. 1724.

† That St. John's Gospel was written, not after, but before the destruction of Jerusalem, see proved by Dr. Lardner, in his Supplement to the Second Part of his Credibility, vol. i. chap. ix. sect. ix. x. p. 391—445.

be crucified, was six in the morning: but St. Mark uses the Jewish computation, according to which the third hour answers to our nine in the morning, at which time Christ was nailed to the cross.

This is an ingenious way of reconciling the two evangelists; and, provided it could be made appear that St. John uses the Roman computation in any other part of his history, we should readily acquiesce in it. But, I apprehend, the contrary is very probable from the following passage in the fourth chapter, ver. 6—8: "Jesus, therefore, being wearied with his journey, sat thus on the well; and it was about the sixth hour. There cometh a woman of Samaria to draw water; Jesus saith unto her, Give me to drink. For his disciples were gone away into the city to buy meat." Now it is not so probable, that the disciples should be gone to procure provisions for their refreshment on their journey at six in the morning as at twelve at noon; much less is it likely, that Christ was wearied with his journey at so early an hour; and if St. John uses the Jewish computation in this part of his history, it is hardly consistent with the character of a good historian to use the Roman in another part of it; at least, without giving notice of the change. Perhaps, therefore, an easier way of solving this difficulty is to admit the reading of the Cambridge manuscript, which has τριτη, the third, instead of εκτη, the sixth hour, in the preceding passage. And this reading is confirmed by Nonnus's Paraphrase,* and by Peter of Alexandria, or whoever was the author of the fragment prefixed to the Chronicon Paschale;† who expressly asserts, that it was τριτη in the original copy,‡ which, he saith, was at that time preserved with great care in the church of Ephesus.§

* See the passage in Dr. Lardner's Credibility, part ii. chap. cxxviii. vol. xi. p. 63.

† Consult Cave, Hist. Literar. ad init. sect. iv.

‡ Chronicon. Paschale, in Præf. auctoris de Paschate, p. 5, edit. Du Fresne, Paris, 1688.

§ See this matter discussed by Dr. Whitby in his Annotations on Mark xv. 25, and by Pfaffius in his Dissertatio Critica de genuinis librorum Novi Testamenti Lectionibus, cap. viii. p. 151—162, edit. Amstel. 1709, who particularly considers what Mill hath advanced against this reading on Mark xv. 25, and John xix. 14.

Before we quit the subject of the Jewish hours, it is proper to take notice of the hours of prayer, which we find mentioned in Scripture. Peter and John, it is said in the Acts, "went up into the temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour;" chap. iii. 1. This, indeed, refers to the public prayers, offered up in the temple at the time of the evening sacrifice. But the Jews had also stated hours for private prayer, at least when they did not attend those which were public. It was Daniel's custom to pray three times a day, which he would not omit, though he was liable on that account to be cast into the den of lions; Dan. vi. 10—12. The same was the practice of David: "Evening, and morning," saith he, "and at noon, will I pray;" Psalm lv. 17. From whence we learn not only how frequently, but at what times of the day that duty was commonly performed. It is generally supposed, that the morning and evening prayers were at the time of offering the morning and evening sacrifice, that is, at the third and ninth hour. And the noon prayer was at the sixth hour, or twelve o'clock; for it is said, that "Peter went up on the house top to pray, about the sixth hour;" Acts x. 9: though Ludovicus Capellus makes the morning and the noon prayer to correspond to the morning and evening sacrifices. According to him, the morning prayer was performed any time between sun-rise and the fourth hour; the noon prayer, between the sixth hour and sun-set; and evening prayer, any time between sun-set and break of day.* We find in Scripture no express institution of the stated hours of prayer. The Jews say, they received them from the patriarchs; the first hour, from Abraham; the second from Isaac; and the third from Jacob.†

From hence the Papists have borrowed their canonical hours; as they call certain prayers, which are to be repeated at certain times of the day, namely, matins, lauds, vespers, and complins. Cardinal Baronius fancies they were instituted by the apostles; of which he imagines, that Peter and John going into the temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth

* Ludov. Capell. in Act. iii. 1, apud Crit. Sacr. See also Mishn. tit. Berachoth, cap. iv.; Bartenor. et Maimon. in loc.; et annot. Guisii et Surenhus. tom. i. p. 13, 14, edit. Surenhus.

† Vid. Drusii Præter. in Act. iii. 1, sive apud Critic. Sacros.

hour, is proof sufficient. Indeed, if we reject this evidence, there is none to be produced of their being instituted earlier than the ninth century, in a capitular* of Hatto, or Hetto, bishop of Basil, directed to his curates, enjoining that none of them be absent at the canonical hours.†

From the Jews the Mohammedans have borrowed their hours of prayer, enlarging the number of them from three to five, which all Mussulmans are bound to observe; the first in the morning before sun-rise; the second, when noon is past, and the sun begins to decline from the meridian; the third, in the afternoon, before sun-set; the fourth, in the evening, after sun-set, and before the day be shut in; the fifth, after the day is shut in, and before the first watch of the night.‡ To these some of their devotees add two more; the first, an hour and a half after the day is shut in, the other at midnight; but these are looked upon as voluntary services, practised in imitation of Mohammed's example, but not enjoined by his law.§

We now proceed to consider the Jewish weeks; which, Godwin observes, were of two sorts; the one ordinary, consisting of seven days; the other extraordinary or prophetical, consisting of seven years.

As for the ordinary week of seven days, it is a division of time, which appears to have been observed by all nations, probably from the beginning of the world.‖ It was first made by God himself, who, after he had created the world in six days, "rested on the seventh, and blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it;" Gen. ii. 2, 3. From whence every seventh day has been ever held sacred.

To prove that this distinction of time prevailed in the first ages of the world, some allege the following passage of the book of Genesis: "In the end of the days, מִקֵּץ יָמִים *mikkèts*

* A capitular is an act passed in a chapter, that is, in an assembly held by religious or military orders, for deliberating on their affairs, and regulating their discipline.

† Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. cent. ix. vol. vii. p. 142.

‡ See Sale's Preliminary Discourse to his Translation of the Koran, sect. iv. p. 107. 109, edit. 1734.

§ De Dieu, Animadversiones in Act. iii. 1.

‖ See Grotius, de Veritate Christianæ Religionis, lib. i. sect. xvi. p. 45, 46, notis Clerici, Glasg. 1745; Selden, de Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. iii. cap. xvi.—xix.

jamim, Cain and Abel brought their offering to the Lord," chap. iv. 3: that is, say they, at the end of the week, or on the sabbath-day; for, according to the learned Gataker, there was then no other distinction of days but into weeks.* We may, however, observe, with deference to so great an authority, that it is not impossible, nor improbable, that by this time they might have learned to distinguish time, by the changes of the moon, into months; and by the course of the sun, and the revolutions of the seasons, into years. It is very evident, that the phrase מקץ ימים *mikkèts jamim* does not always import the end of a week, from the use of it in the Second Book of Samuel, chap. xiv. 26; where it is said, that "at the end of the days, Absalom polled his head, because his hair was heavy on him; and he weighed it at two hundred shekels." It cannot be imagined his hair should grow so heavy as to need polling every week. Probably, in this place, the phrase means, as we render it, "at every year's end." In the same sense the learned Ainsworth understands it in the passage in Genesis, which we are now considering: "at the end of the year," when the fruits of the earth were ripe, "Cain brought of the fruits of the ground an offering unto the Lord." So God afterward appointed "a feast of ingathering," to be observed by the Jews in the end of the year, "when they had gathered in their labours out of the field;" Exod. xxiii. 16. The same custom prevailed among the Gentiles, who at the end of the year, when they gathered in their fruits, offered solemn sacrifices, with thanks to God for his blessings. Aristotle says,† that the ancient sacrifices and assemblies were after the gathering in of the fruits, being designed for an oblation of the first-fruits unto God. Again, days are put for years in the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus, ver. 29: "within a year shall he redeem it:" in the Hebrew, ימים *jamim*, which yet is immediately explained to signify a whole year. It is therefore probable, that it was at the end of the year, Cain brought of his ripe fruits an offering unto the Lord.

Nevertheless, though the evidence of this passage, in favour of the antiquity of distinguishing time by weeks, fail us, we have other sufficient proofs of its being used in very early ages.

* Vid. Poli. Synops. in Gen. iv. 3.

† Aristot. Ethic. lib. viii. cap. ix. sub finem.

It appears, that Noah divided his days by sevens, in sending the dove out of the ark, Gen. viii. 10—13; and that the same division was used in Jacob's time; for in the history of his marriage with Leah and Rachel, we meet with this expression, "Laban said, Fulfil her week, שבע *shebhuang*, and we will give thee this also for the service which thou shalt serve with me yet seven other years;" chap. xxix. 27. That the word שבע *shebhuang* here signifies a week of days, is plain from its being expressly distinguished from seven years; and also because it was the custom in ancient times to keep marriage feasts for seven days. It is said of Samson's wife, that "she wept before him the seven days, while their marriage-feast lasted," in order to obtain from him the interpretation of a riddle, for explaining which "within the seven days of the feast," he had offered a reward to his guests; Judges xiv. 12. 17.

As for the extraordinary or prophetical weeks, they consisted of seven years each. And it is not unlikely, that this sort of computation by weeks of years, which is used in the prophetic writings, owed its origin to the expressions in which Moses records the institution of the year of jubilee: "Thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years; and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years: then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound, and ye shall hallow the fiftieth year;" Lev. xxv. 8—10. Accordingly a day is put for a year in Ezekiel, where three hundred and ninety days means as many years, and forty days forty years: "I have appointed thee, saith the Lord, each day for a year;" chap. iv. 5, 6. In the same sense seven days, or a week, is in the prophetic style seven years. Of this sort are the seventy weeks in the ninth chapter of Daniel's prophecy, ver. 24, which appears from hence, that having occasion immediately after this prophecy to mention weeks in the ordinary acceptation of the word, he expressly calls them, by way of distinction from the weeks he had been before speaking of, "weeks of days," chap. x. 1—3; for so is the expression in the original, which we render, "three full weeks."* Besides,

* Mayer de Temporibus et Festis Hebræor. part i. cap. x. sect. v. p. 65, edit. Amstel. 1724; Marshall's Chronological Treatise on the Seventy Weeks of Daniel, p. 8, 9, Lond. 1724.

it is certain, that so many great events as are predicted to come to pass in the space of seventy weeks, could not be crowded into seventy weeks of days, which is less than one year and a half. The seventy prophetical weeks, therefore, amount to four hundred and ninety years.

Months, with the Hebrews, take their name from the moon; the word חדש *chodhesh,* being used by them to signify both a new moon, and a month; because their months began with a new moon. And therefore they consisted of twenty-nine or thirty days; for since the synodical lunar month is nearly twenty-nine days and a half, they made their months to consist of twenty-nine and thirty days alternately; so that what one month wanted of being equal to the synodical course of the moon, was made up in the next; and by this means their months were made to keep even pace, pretty nearly, with the lunations. Thus was the Jewish calendar regulated by the law of Moses, which appointed the day of the new moon, or rather perhaps the first day of its appearance, to be a solemn festival, and the beginning of a month. But it should seem, that at the time of the deluge they were not come to this regulation; but then the years consisted of twelve months, and each month of thirty days. That the year consisted of twelve months, may be inferred from the time that Noah lived in the ark, namely, a year and ten days; for the flood began on the seventeenth day of the second month of the six hundredth year of Noah's life (see Gen. vii. 11), and on the twenty-seventh of the second month, in the six hundred and first year of his life, was the earth dried; chap. viii. 13, 14.* Now if the month consisted of thirty days, as we shall presently show that it did; and if the year then in use was nearly either lunar or solar, there must have been twelve months in the year; for thirty multiplied by twelve is three hundred and sixty, that is, six days more than the lunar year, and five less

* In the thirteenth verse it is said, that "in the six hundred and first year, the first day of the month, the waters were dried from the earth, and Noah removed the covering of the ark, and looked, and behold the face of the ground was dry." This must be understood of the waters being so far dried from off the face of the earth, that they no longer stood on the ground; nevertheless, the earth was not sufficiently hardened to be fit for habitation till near two months after, when, on the twenty-seventh day of the second month, Noah left the ark.

than the solar. Perhaps the form of the year then used was the same afterward used by the Egyptians, consisting of twelve months and five days.

That the month, in Noah's time, consisted of thirty days, is made out thus. It is said in the account of the deluge, that "in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, the fountains of the great deep were broken up," chap. vii. 11; and afterward it is said, "the ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat;" chap. viii. 4. From the beginning of the flood, therefore, to the time of the ark's resting, was just five months. Now the waters are said to have prevailed upon the earth one hundred and fifty days, chap. vii. 24; viii. 3, 4. that is, till the time of the ark's resting; and one hundred and fifty divided by five, the number of the months, gives just thirty days for each month.

From this account of the antediluvian months and years, we may infer the absurdity of the supposition, which Varro and others have made, in order to take off the wonder of men's living so long before the flood, as the Scripture history relates; namely, that their ages are to be computed, not by solar years, but by months; whereas it plainly appears, that they computed by months and years before the flood, as we now do, and that their years were nearly equal to ours; and it cannot be thought so good an historian as Moses would use the word years for months only, in some part of his antediluvian history, and for twelve months in other parts of it. Besides, this way of computing will reduce the lives of the ancient patriarchs to a shorter period than ours. Peleg, who is said to have lived two hundred and thirty-nine years, Gen. xi. 19, will be found in reality to have lived only about twenty years; and Serug, who is said to have lived two hundred and thirty years, chap. xi. 23, must have lived but a little more than nineteen; and both of them must have begot children before they were three years old, instead of thirty, according to the Scripture account.

Godwin is undoubtedly mistaken, when he saith, "that the Jews before their captivity, counted their months without any names, according to their number, as the first, the second

month, &c." For we meet with the names of months in the Scripture history long before that period; as the month Abib, Exod. xiii. 4; the month Zif, 1 Kings vi. 1. 37; the month Bul, ver. 38; and the month Ethanim; chap. viii. 2.

We proceed now to consider the Jewish year, which was partly lunar and wandering, and partly solar and fixed. It consisted sometimes of twelve, and sometimes of thirteen synodical months; ordinarily it consisted of twelve synodical months, amounting to three hundred and fifty-four days. As the years of this form fall eleven days short of the solar year, had they used them constantly, their months and festivals would have wandered in thirty-two years through all the seasons. But since the rites they were to perform at some of their festivals had a necessary connexion with a particular season of the year; as the offering the first-fruits of the wheat-harvest at the feast of pentecost, which must necessarily be kept in the summer, and their dwelling in booths at the feast of tabernacles, which would have been highly inconvenient in winter; it was necessary by some means to reduce the lunar years to the solar, that their months, and consequently their festivals, might always fall at the same season. This therefore they did by adding a whole month to the year, as often as it was needful, commonly once in three, and sometimes once in two years. This intercalary month was added at the end of the year, after the month Adar, and was therefore called ואדר *veadar*, or a second Adar.*

The year was also distinguished into the civil and sacred year; each of which had a different beginning. The civil began with the equinoctial new moon in autumn; the sacred, or ecclesiastical, with the equinoctial new moon in spring. The civil, according to which all political matters were regulated, was the more ancient, and was perhaps the same with the patriarchal year, which we gave an account of before, and which is supposed to have originally commenced at the creation. Hence, since this year began in autumn, some have thought it probable the world was created at that season, or in its autumnal state, with respect to that hemisphere in which

* Maimon. de Consecratione Calendarum, cap. iv. sect. i. p. 356, ad calcem tractatus de sacrificiis, edit. et vers. De Veil, Lond. 1683.

Adam was placed.* But the premises, from which this inference is drawn, are somewhat uncertain, namely, that the ancient year was a fixed solar year, always beginning at the same season; whereas we have before shown, that the patriarchal year consisted of twelve months of thirty days each, which fell about five days short of the true solar year. Unless, therefore, we suppose, as some have done,† that they added five days to their last month, according to the form of the *annus Nabonassarius*, or the Egyptian year,‡ which five days were called ἡμεραι επαγομεναι, this year must have been wandering, and the beginning of it have run through all the seasons. Nay, even supposing the addition of the ἡμεραι επαγομεναι, yet the neglect of five hours forty-nine minutes, by which the Egyptian year fell short of the true solar year, would make the beginning of it wander through all the seasons in about fourteen hundred years; so that, though it happened to begin at the autumnal equinox at the time when Moses regulated the Jewish calendar, it might have begun originally at another season. However, it is thought, that the feast of in-gathering of the harvest, which must certainly be at autumn, being said to be "in the end of the year," Exod. xxiii. 16, xxxiv. 22, favours the opinion that the ancient year begun at that season. Therefore, though some have supposed, that the world was created in spring,§ the more commonly received opinion is, that it was created in autumn. In support of which some allege the following passage in the first chapter of Genesis, "The earth brought forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself," ver. 11; which, they say, must be in autumn, when the fruits are ripe.

As for the Jewish sacred, or ecclesiastical year, it began

* Vid. Meyer. de Temporibus et Festis Hebræor. part i. cap. i. p. 4—17, Amstel. 1724; et Fred. Spanhemii Chronol. Sacr. part i. cap. i.; Talmud. tit. Rosh Hashanah, cap. i.; Abarbanel de Principio, Anni et Consecratione Novilunii ad Calcem, lib. Cozri, p. 443—445, edit. Buxtorf. 1660.

† Vid. Spanheim. Chronol. Sacr. part i. cap. iii. p. 8, Oper. Geograph. Chronolog. &c. Lugd. Bat. 1701.

‡ See Strauchius's Chronology, by Sault, book iv. chap. xviii. p. 261, Lond. 1722.

§ Jacobi Capelli Observ. in Gen. i. 14, p. 583, edit. unâ cum Lud. Capell. Comment. et Not. Critic. in Vet. Test., Amstel. 1689.

with the month Nisan, the seventh of the civil year, about the vernal equinox; Exod. xii. 2, *et seq.* By this year the order of all their religious ceremonies was regulated; so that the passover, which was kept in the middle of the first month of this year, was, as it were, the mother of all the other festivals.

While the Jews continued in the land of Canaan, the beginnings of their months and years were not settled by any astronomical rules or calculations, but by the phasis or actual appearance of the new moon. When they saw the new moon, they began the month. Persons were therefore appointed to watch on the tops of the mountains for the first appearance of the moon after the change. As soon as they saw it, they informed the Sanhedrim, and public notice was given by lighting beacons throughout the land; though after they had been often deceived by the Samaritans, who kindled false fires, they used, say the mishnical rabbies, to proclaim its appearance by sending messengers. Yet as they had no months longer than thirty days, if they did not see the new moon the night following the thirtieth day, they concluded the appearance was obstructed by the clouds, and without watching any longer, made the next day the first day of the following month.* But after the Jews became dispersed through all nations, where they had no opportunity of being informed of the first appearance of the new moon, as they formerly had, they were forced to make use of astronomical calculations and cycles for fixing the beginning of their months and years.† The first cycle they made use of for this purpose was of eighty-four years. But that being discovered to be faulty, they came afterward into the use of Meto's cycle of nineteen years, which was established by the authority of Rabbi Hillel Hannasi, or prince of the Sanhedrim, about the year of Christ 360. This they still use, and say, it is to be observed till the coming of the Messiah. In the compass of this cycle there are twelve common years, consisting of twelve months, and seven intercalary years, consisting of thirteen months.‡

We find the Jews and their ancestors computing their years

* Vid. Mish. tit. Rosh. Hashanah, cap. ii. sect. i.—vii.; Maimon. de Consecratione Calendarum, cap. iii. sect. v.—viii. p. 352.

† Maimon. de Consecratione Calendarum, cap. v. sect. i.—iii. p. 362.

‡ See Prideaux's Connect. part i. preface.

from different eras, in different parts of the Old Testament; as from the birth of the patriarchs; for instance, of Noah, Gen. vii. 11; viii. 13; afterward from their exit out of Egypt, Numb. xxxiii. 38; 1 Kings vi. 1; then from the building of Solomon's temple, 2 Chron. viii. 1; and from the reigns of the kings of Judah and Israel. In later times the Babylonish captivity furnished them with a new epocha, from whence they computed their years: Ezek. xxxiii. 21; xl. 1. But since the times of the talmudical rabbies they have constantly used the era of the creation, which, according to their computation,* in this present year of the Christian era, 1762, is A. M. 5522. They usually in writing contract this by omitting the thousands, writing only תקכב, 522.† If to the Jewish year, thus expressed, you add 1240, it gives the year of the Christian era, as 522 with the addition of 1240 makes 1762.‡

If it be inquired, why God appointed a new beginning of the year to the Israelites at the time of their deliverance out of Egypt, the answer may perhaps be,

1st. The more effectually to distinguish and separate his own people from the idolatrous nations, and detach them from their customs; to which end the beginning their days, their weeks, their months, and their years, at a different time from those of the idolaters, was undoubtedly subservient.

2dly. Because the month, in which they were delivered out of Egypt, and in which such a surprising series of miracles was wrought in their favour, might be well accounted a sort of *mensis natalis* of that nation, in which God as it were revived them from a state of death, and took them under his future special protection and providence; on which account, to set a particular mark upon that month, and to perpetuate the memory of so great a mercy, he ordered, that it should stand at the head of the months, and be reckoned the first of the year.

* The Jews reckon only 3760 years from the creation to the birth of Christ. See Scalig. de Emendat. Tempor. lib. vii. p. 628, and Strauchius's Chronol. by Sault, book iv. chap. ii. p. 168—171.

† This is called the *computus minor;* when the thousands are expressed at length it is called *computus major.*

‡ Reland. Antiq. Heb. part iv. cap. i. sect. viii. p. 428, 429, 3d edit.

CHAPTER II.

OF THEIR FEASTS.

"As, among the Jews, their ordinary meals," saith Godwin, "were not many in a day, so neither were they costly; and therefore they were called ארחת *aruchoth*, which properly signifieth such fare as travellers use on their journeys; whereas the extraordinary and more liberal kind of entertainment was commonly called משתה *mishteh*." There is no doubt, but the word ארחה *aruchah*, as it comes from the root ארח *arach, iter fecit*, properly and primarily signifies provisions on a journey, or such a meal as was common with travellers, which can hardly be supposed to have been either elegant or plentiful in those countries where there were no inns or houses of entertainment on the road, and where travellers used to carry their provisions with them; and though, as Godwin observes, the word is used for a mean and scanty meal in the book of Proverbs, chap. xv. 17, where ארחת ירק *aruchath jarak*, a dinner of herbs, stands in opposition to a stalled or fatted ox; nevertheless, as the whole life of man is represented as a pilgrimage or journey, the word ארחה *aruchah*, in an allusive sense, is used for a meal in general, whether sumptuous or mean, whether plentiful or sparing. In the book of Jeremiah, chap. lii. 34, it is used for the daily provision which the king of Babylon allotted to Jehoiakim king of Judah, after he had brought him out of prison, and set his throne above the thrones of all the kings that were with him in Babylon, and admitted him to eat bread continually before him, ver. 31—33; and no doubt the provisions of his table were plentiful and elegant.

The word משתה *mishteh*, from שתה *shathah, bibit*, answers to the Greek συμποσιον, and primarily signifies *compotatio;* or perhaps, as we call it, a drinking bout. And as delicious

liquors were always supposed to make a considerable part of an elegant entertainment, the word משתה *mishteh* is used, by a synecdoche, for a feast in general; such as Abraham made at the weaning of Isaac, Gen. xxi. 8; Pharaoh on his birth-day, chap. xl. 20; Samson at his wedding, Judges xiv. 10; and Isaac for Abimelech and his friends, who, it is expressly said, ate as well as drank; chap. xxvi. 30. "A feast of fat things" is called משתה *mishteh*, as well as "a feast of wine;" Isa. xxv. 6. And as the Hebrews sometimes denominated their feasts from drinking, so likewise from eating: "Jacob offered sacrifice on the mount, and called his brethren to eat bread," &c.; Gen. xxxi. 54. Belshazzar made a great feast, לחם *lechem* (Dan. v. 1; see also Eccles. x. 19), which primarily signifies bread. At other times it was denominated from both: "Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled:" Prov. ix. 5; see also Eccles. ix. 7.

It is Godwin's opinion, that the *agapæ*, or love feasts, of the primitive Christians, were derived from the חגים *chiggim*, or feasts upon the sacrifices, at which the Jews entertained their friends and fed the poor; Deut. xii. 18; xxvi. 12.

There were also feasts of much the same kind in use among the Greeks and Romans. The former were wont to offer certain sacrifices to their gods, which were afterward given to the poor. They had likewise public feasts for certain districts, suppose for a town or city, toward which all who could afford it, contributed, in proportion to their different abilities, and all partook of it in common. Of this sort were the Συσσιτια of the Cretans; and the Φιδιτια of the Lacedemonians, instituted by Lycurgus, and so called παρα της φιλιας (the λ being changed into δ according to their usual orthography), as denoting that love and friendship which they were intended to promote among neighbours and fellow-citizens.*

The Romans likewise had a feast of the same kind, called *charistia;* which was a meeting only of those who were akin to each other; and the design of it was, that if any quarrel or misunderstanding had happened among any of them, they

* Vid. Cragium de Republ. Lacedæm. lib. i. cap. ix.; apud Gronov. Thesaur. Græc. Antiq. vol. v. p. 2541; et Stuckii Antiquitat. Convivial. lib. i. cap. xxxi.

might there be reconciled.* To this Ovid alludes in the second book of his Fasti:

> Proxima cognati dixere charistia chari,
> Et venit ad socios turba propinqua deos.
> V. 617.

In imitation either of these Jewish or Gentile love feasts, or probably of both, the primitive Christians, in each particular church, had likewise their love feasts, which were supplied by the contribution of the members, according to their several abilities, and partaken of by all in common. And whether they were converts from among the Jews or Gentiles, they retained their old custom with very little alteration, and as their αγαπαι had been commonly annexed to their sacrifices, so they were now annexed to the commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ at the Lord's supper; and were therefore held on the Lord's day before or after the celebration of that ordinance. It should seem at Corinth, in the apostle's days, they were ordinarily held before; for when the Corinthians are blamed for unworthily receiving the Lord's supper, it is partly charged upon this, that some of them came drunk to that ordinance, having indulged to excess at the preceding love feast: "Every one taketh before, προλαμβανει, his own supper, and one is hungry and another is drunken;" 1 Cor. xi. 21.† This shows, saith Dr. Whitby, that this banquet, namely the love feast, was celebrated before the Lord's supper. But Chrysostom gives an account of it, as being in his time kept after it.‡

It is commonly supposed, that when St. Jude mentions certain persons, who were spots in the feasts of charity, εν ταις αγαπαις, ver 12, he means in the Christian love feasts; though Dr. Lightfoot and Dr. Whitby apprehend the reference in this passage is rather to a custom of the Jews, who on the evening of their sabbath had their κοινωνια, or com-

* Valer. Maxim. lib. ii. cap. i. sect. viii. p. 136, edit. Thysii. Lugd. Bat. 1655.

† See Whitby in loc.

‡ Vid. Suiceri Thesaur. in verb αγαπη. This opinion is maintained by Mr. Hallet in his Notes and Discourses, vol. iii. disc. vi., and by Dr. Chandler in his account of the Conference in Nicholas-Lane, Feb. 13, 1734-5, between two Romish priests and some Protestant divines, p. 55—62.

munion, when the inhabitants of the same city met in a common place to eat together.* However that be, all antiquity bears testimony to the reality of the Christian αγαπαι, or love feasts. Indeed, Suicer conceives they are referred to in the following passage of the Acts: "They," that is, the apostles, "continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart;" chap. ii. 46. And when it is said, that "the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables," chap. vi. 2, he supposes the tables mean these love feasts: which expression, I think, primarily refers to the tables of the poor of the church, or to the making a proper provision for them; as appears from its having been mentioned as the ground of complaint of "the Grecians against the Hebrews, that their widows were neglected in the daily ministration," ver. 1. To the love feasts he likewise refers the following passage concerning St. Paul: "When he had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, he departed;" chap. xx. 11. But this may very naturally and properly be understood of the Lord's supper. Indeed, how far St. Paul might join in these love feasts with other Christians, before they were abused, does not appear. But when he blamed the scandalous irregularities of the Corinthians, in their participation of the Lord's supper, which were very much occasioned by their preceding love feasts, and in order to bring them back to its original simplicity and purity, gives them a very particular account of the primitive institution, 1 Cor. xi. 23, *et seq.*, in which there is not one word of these *agapæ;* he evidently condemns the addition they had made to this ordinance, which had occasioned so much sin, and so many disorders and confusions.

However, the *agapæ* were not wholly laid aside till some ages after. For they are mentioned by Ignatius,† by Clemens of Alexandria,‡ by Tertullian,§ and even by St.

* Whitby in loc. and Lightfoot, Horæ Hebraic. 1 Cor. x. 16.

† Epist. ad Smyrn. sect. viii. apud Coteler. Patres Apostol. p. 37, vol. ii. edit. Clerici 2, 1724.

‡ Pædag. lib. ii. p. 141, B, et Strom. lib. iii. p. 430, C, D, ed. Paris, 1641.

§ Apolog. cap. xxxix. p. 32, edit. Rigalt. Paris, 1675.

Jerome* and St. Austin† in the fourth century, as practised in their times.

Dr. Lightfoot hath a peculiar notion concerning these Christian *agapæ*, that they were a sort of hospitals for the entertainment of strangers, in imitation of those which the Jews had adjoining to their synagogues. And Gaius, who is called "the host of the whole church," Rom. xvi. 23, he supposes to have been the master of such an hospital; and that Phœbe, who is called the διακονος of the church at Cenchrea, chap. xvi. 1, and those other women, who in the Epistle to the Philippians are said to labour in the gospel, chap. iv. 3, were servants attending these hospitals. Nevertheless, he does not call in question the ancient use of love feasts together with the eucharist: to doubt of that, he says, would be to contradict all antiquity. But he seems to question, whether they were so ancient as the days of the apostles.‡ However, notwithstanding all the doctor has said, on the authority of the rabbies, of these Jewish hospitals, which he supposes the Christians to have imitated in their *agapæ*, it may reasonably be doubted, whether they had ordinarily such hospitals adjoining to their churches so early as the days of the apostles; for as yet they had hardly any churches or buildings appropriated to Christian worship, but were forced to meet in private houses, and often secretly, to avoid the rage and violence of their persecutors. Nor can I think it so probable, that the Corinthians, who were for the most part Gentile converts, should borrow the institution of such hospitals from the Jews, as that they should borrow their former custom, and that of their ancestors, in annexing love feasts to their sacrifices, and so adopt them into Christian worship.

Godwin hath discoursed pretty largely on the ceremonies used by the Jews at their feasts. And under the head of salutation, as one of their preparatory cèremonies, he occasionally mentions the prophet Elisha's order to his servant Gehazi, "If thou meet with any man, salute him not; and if any man salute thee, answer him not again;" 2 Kings iv. 29. It is inquired, whether this is to be taken for a general pro-

* Ad Eustoc. de Custod. Virgin. epist. xxii. p. 286, D, Paris, 1579.

† Contra Faustum Manich. lib. xx. cap. xx.

‡ See Hor. Hebraic. 1 Cor. xi. 21.

hibition of all ceremonies betokening civil respect, according to the usage of the modern Quakers; or only as an injunction peculiar to the present occasion? I apprehend, there is no reason to take it for a general prohibition, since in the Scripture history, we find such ceremonies of civil respect practised by good men, without any censure passed upon them; as by Moses to his father-in-law, Exod. xviii. 7; by Abraham to the three angels, whom he took for three men, Gen. xviii. 2; and afterward to the children of Heth; chap. xxiii. 7. Besides, when our Saviour sent forth the twelve apostles to preach, he enjoined them to pay to all persons and families, where they came, the usual tokens of civility and respect: "When ye come into a house, salute it;" Matt. x. 12. The reason, then, of Elisha's forbidding his servant either to give, or return, a salutation to any man, was probably either on account of the expedition which the prophet supposed his journey to the Shunamite required (for perhaps he did not understand her child was quite dead, when he ordered Gehazi to go and lay his staff on it); or else it might be to keep the child's death, out of tenderness, a secret to the father, till he was raised to life again; and if the servant so much as spoke to any person on the road, he might imprudently divulge it.

This may enable us to account for a prohibition of the same kind, given by Christ to the seventy disciples, when he sent them "two and two before his face, to every city and place, whither he himself would come;" Luke x. 1. 4. "Carry," saith he, "neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes, and salute no man by the way." We may with equal reason suppose, that our Lord intended to forbid his disciples and ministers the use of shoes and purses, as the customary tokens of civil respect. His design was only to prohibit them while they were employed on that particular message. It is farther inquired, why he forbad it at this time? Dr. Lightfoot, from the rabbies, observes, that it was the custom of the Jews, during the days of their mourning, not to salute any one. He conceives, therefore, that our Saviour would have his disciples appear like mourners; partly as representing himself, who was a man of sorrow, that so from these messengers the people might guess, in some measure, what sort of person he was who sent them; partly, as they were to summon the people to

attend upon Christ, in order to be healed, both of their spiritual and their bodily diseases; and it was, therefore, fit their behaviour should be mournful and solemn, in token of their fellow-feeling with the afflicted and miserable.*

But the testimony of the rabbies is too week a foundation to support this interpretation. The custom mentioned might have prevailed in their times without being near so ancient as our Saviour's. It may also be objected, that our blessed Lord was so far from desiring his disciples should appear as mourners, that he represents this to be unsuitable to their condition, while he, the bridegroom, was with them; Matt. ix. 15.

Perhaps, therefore, the prohibition of saluting any man by the way may be taken in a more general sense, as a caution against trifling away their time in compliment and ceremony. Or, if we understand it more literally, it might be designed to make the disciples appear as men in haste, and fully occupied, whose minds were intent on the dispatch of the most important business; to awaken the people's attention to their message, and at the same time, like the symbolical actions of the prophets, to represent in a sensible manner the main drift and tenor of it, namely, that sinners should make all possible speed to fly from the wrath to come, and lay hold on eternal life, and for that end should apply to Christ in earnest and without delay.

The second preparatory ceremony, mentioned by Godwin, is washing the feet of the guests. However, it does not appear in the institution of any of the Jewish feasts, nor by any Scripture examples, that this was ever used, except when persons had defiled their feet by travelling. And, indeed, if it had been a constant custom, I can hardly think, that Simon the Pharisee, who civilly invited our Lord to an entertainment at his house, would have omitted it; Luke vii. 44.

The instance produced, namely, our Saviour's washing his disciples' feet, John xiii. 5, is quite beside the purpose; since that was plainly an extraordinary case, performed, not out of respect to any custom, but with a particular intent of instructing them in the duties of humility and condescending benevolence; ver. 13—15. Besides, this was not done be-

* Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. Luc. x. 4.

fore they began supper, but in some interval of the meal, as appears from its being said of our Lord, that "he arose from supper, and laid aside his garments, and took a towel and girded himself," ver. 4. We conclude from hence, that the disciples had not washed their feet before supper; for it is highly improbable, that Christ should choose to set them an example of mutual condescension and benevolence by an action, which, if they had been washed before, was altogether needless.*

It is Godwin's apprehension, that the six water-pots of stone, mentioned on occasion of the marriage at Cana of Galilee, John ii. 6, and said to be "after the manner of the purifying of the Jews," were designed for these complimental washings. But as the word καθαρισμος is commonly, if not always, used for the purifying or washing the whole body, as for the purifying of a woman after child-birth, Luke ii. 22, and of a leper after his cure, chap. v. 14; Mark i. 44; in both which cases the law prescribed that the body should be washed or bathed all over; some have thought it more probable, that these water-pots were such as were used for that purpose. And if we consider how many legal pollutions, unavoidably and frequently contracted, required this larger purification, especially among the women, it is likely that all persons, who could provide conveniences for it, would keep sufficient quantities of water in their houses ready for such occasions. According to this opinion, these water-pots must have been large vessels. How large is not certain. The text says, they "contained two or three μετρηται apiece;" a word which, though it properly signifies a measure in the general, was yet doubtless in common use for some particular measure; otherwise, this account of the contents of these water-pots would be altogether indeterminate, and convey no idea at all. It is probable, therefore, that as the word rod, in English, which primarily signifies a stick to measure with, of any length, is yet appropriated to that particular measure of length which is most used in measuring lands, namely, five yards and a half, the word μετρητη was particularly appro-

* That washing the feet was not an usual preparatory ceremony, is shown at large by Buxtorf, in his Dissert. Philolog. Theolog. dissert. vi. de Cænæ Domin. primæ ritibus et formâ, sect. xxx. p. 302—306, Basil. 1662.

priated to that measure of capacity which was most used by the Jews in measuring liquids, and that was the בת *bath*. This is still more probable, because the Septuagint renders the word *bath*, by μετρητη, in the fourth chapter of the Second Book of Chronicles, ver. 5. Now the bath, according to Dr. Cumberland, contains seven gallons and a quarter. Each water-pot, therefore, may be supposed to contain about twenty gallons, and all of them, when filled to the brim, as they were when our Saviour turned the water into wine, about a hundred and twenty.*

As to the design of this miracle, we are not to suppose that Christ produced so great a quantity of wine, merely or chiefly for use of the guests at that entertainment. Besides the grand purpose of displaying his divine power, he might hereby intend to make a handsome present to the new-married couple, as such a quantity of excellent wine undoubtedly was, in grateful return for their favour in inviting him and his disciples to the marriage feast.

As to the third preparatory ceremony, pouring out oil, I can find no sufficient evidence of this being in common use. The woman's anointing our Saviour's head with ointment, which St. Luke mentions, chap. vii. 37, 38, and to which Godwin refers, was without doubt an extraordinary case.

As to the ברכה *barachah*, or benediction of the bread and wine, from whence many others suppose, as well as Godwin, that our Saviour borrowed the rites which he used in the celebration of his supper; the authority of the rabbinical writers, who mention this *barachah*, is too precarious to furnish a certain conclusion, that it was in use among the Jews in our Saviour's time. The correspondence between the sacramental rites and those of the Jewish *barachah*, as practised in the days of the talmudical rabbies, may be seen at large in Buxtorf on this subject.†

The last thing which Godwin mentions as remarkable in the feasts of the Jews, was their table gesture:‡ and this was

* See on this subject a Dissertation of Hostus, in the Critici Sacri, vol. ix.

† Buxtorf. Dissertationes Philolog. Theolog. dissert. de Cænæ Domin. primæ ritibus et formâ.

‡ Vid. Buxtorf. ubi supra, sect. xxxii.—xl. p. 306—309; et Lightfoot, Horæ Hebr. in Matt. xxvi. 20.

reclining on couches after the manner of the Romans,* the upper part of the body resting upon the left elbow, and the lower lying at length upon the couch. When two or three reclined on the same couch, some say the worthiest or most honourable person lay first; Lightfoot says, in the middle.† The next in dignity lay with his head reclining on the breast or bosom of the first; as John is said to have done on the bosom of Jesus at supper; John xiii. 23. And hence is borrowed the phrase of Abraham's bosom, as denoting the state of celestial happiness; Luke xvi. 22. Abraham being esteemed the most honourable person, and the father of the Jewish nation, to be in his bosom signifies, in allusion to the order in which guests were placed at an entertainment, the highest state of felicity next to that of Abraham himself.

* Plutarchi Sympos. lib. v. problem. vi. p. 769. 780, edit. Francofurt, 1620. See the accubitus of the Romans described, with a delineation from some antique marbles, by Hieron. Mercurialis, de Arte Gymnast. lib. i. cap. xi. Amstel. 1672.

† Horæ Hebr. John xiii. 23.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE SABBATH.

The word sabbath, from שבת *shabath, quievit,* is used in Scripture, in a limited sense, for the seventh day of the week, which, by the Jewish law, was peculiarly consecrated to the service of God; and, in a more extensive sense, for other holy days, as for the annual fast, or day of atonement, on the tenth of the month Tizri, Lev. xxiii. 32; and, in the New Testament, the word σαββατον is sometimes used for a week: "I fast twice in a week," Νηστευω δις του σαββατου, Luke xviii. 12; and μια σαββατων signifies the first day of the week; Matt. xxviii. 1. But commonly the word sabbath is peculiarly appropriated to the seventh day.

In the sixth chapter of St. Luke, we read of the σαββατων δευτεροπρωτον, ver. 1; the explaining of which has given the critics and commentators not a little trouble. Some allege there were two sabbaths in the year, each of them called the first, in respect to the two different beginnings of the year, the civil and the sacred. That the Jews had some peculiar regard to the first sabbath in the year, appears from a passage in Clemens Alexandrinus, εαν μη σεληνη φανη, σαββατον ουκ αγουσι το λεγομενον, πρωτον,* "Nisi luna appareat, sabbatum non celebrant quod primum dicitur," &c. Now, as their year had two different beginnings, one with the month Tizri in autumn, the other with the month Nisan in spring, there were consequently two first sabbaths, of which this, according to the computation of the civil year, was the second, and is therefore called δευτεροπρωτον, or the second-first sabbath.

Grotius, whose opinion is followed by Dr. Hammond, conceives, that when any of the solemn yearly feasts fell on the sabbath-day, that sabbath had a special respect paid to it, and was called μεγα, or (which Dr. Hammond saith is the same

* Strom. lib. vi. p. 636, A, edit. Paris, 1741.

thing) σαββατον πρωτον. Now, of these prime or first sabbaths, there were three in the year, at the passover, at pentecost, and at the feast of tabernacles. The first of them, that is, when the first day of the passover fell on the sabbath-day, was called πρωτοπρωτον σαββατον, or the first prime sabbath. The second, that is, when the day of pentecost fell on the sabbath, was called δευτεροπρωτον, which, he apprehends, was the sabbath here intended.* But as neither Grotius nor Hammond have produced any passage, in which either the word πρωτοπρωτον, or τριτοπρωτον, occurs, this interpretation remains doubtful and uncertain. Sir Isaac Newton imagines this σαββατον δευτεροπρωτον was the second great day of the feast of the passover: as we call Easter-day, high Easter, and its octave, low Easter, or Low Sunday; so it seems St. Luke styles the feast, on the seventh day of the unleavened bread, the second of the two prime sabbaths.† To this sense Dr. Doddridge objects, that though the seventh day of unleavened bread was to be an holy convocation, yet the law expressly allowed the Jews to dress victuals on it, Exod. xii. 16; and therefore the Pharisees could have had no pretence for charging Christ's disciples with breaking the sabbath by their plucking and rubbing the ears of corn on that day, as they did; Luke vi. 2.

Theophylact,‡ who is followed by J. Scaliger,§ Lightfoot,‖ and Whitby, makes the σαββατον δευτεροπρωτον to be the first of the seven sabbaths between the passover and pentecost, or the first sabbath after the second day of unleavened bread, from whence the fifty days to pentecost were computed; Lev. xxiii. 15, 16. There want only instances of the word δευτεροδευτερον being used for the second, and δευτεροτριτον for the third of these sabbaths, to confirm this sense beyond dispute. However, though it be not quite free from uncertainty, it seems to stand as fair in point of probability as any of them.¶

* Grotii et Hammondi Annot. in loc.

† Sir Isaac Newton's Observations on the Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation, p. 154.

‡ Comment. in loc.

§ Scalig. de Emendat. Temp. lib. vi. p. 557, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1621.

‖ Lightfoot, Horæ Hebraic. in loc. et in Matt. xii. 1.

¶ See Whitby and Doddridge in loc.

Thus much for the word sabbath: we proceed to treat of the thing.

It hath been controverted, both among Jews and Christians, whether the sabbath was first instituted immediately after the creation, and given to Adam and Eve in Paradise; or whether the account of God's blessing the seventh day and sanctifying it, which Moses mentions in connexion with God's resting on the seventh day, when the work of creation was finished, Gen. ii. 3, is to be understood proleptically of his appointing that day to be observed as a sabbath, not at that time, but by the Israelites many ages afterward.

Limborch,* Le Clerc,† and some other learned men, are of the latter opinion. But surely it is more natural to understand this passage as relating to the time in which it is placed in the series of the history, that is, to the first ages of the world, previous to the fall. The chief reason for understanding it proleptically is, that there is no mention of the sabbath afterward, in the sacred history, till the time of Moses, that is, for about two thousand five hundred years. However, the same argument will hardly be admitted in the case of circumcision, of which there is no express mention in Scripture, or, however, no instance recorded of the observation of it, from the settlement of the Israelites in Canaan, to the circumcision of Christ. Nevertheless, as this rite was the sign of the covenant with Abraham and his posterity, and the characteristic of the peculiar people of God, its being constantly observed cannot reasonably be called in question, especially as the heathen are called "the uncircumcised," in contradistinction to the Israelites, which implies, that it was practised constantly by the latter. The silence of history with respect to the continuance of a rite or custom, well known to have been instituted or adopted, is no argument against such continuance, provided the reason on which the institution was originally grounded, remains the same. It can by no means be concluded, that because there is no express mention of the observation of a sabbath in the patriarchal history, therefore no sabbath

* Limborc. Theolog. Christian. lib. v. cap. xxviii. sect. vii.—ix. p. 478, 479, edit. Amstel. 1715.

† Clerici Annot. in Gen. ii. 3.

was observed in those times. On the contrary, that the sabbath was instituted at the time to which Moses's relation of the institution of it refers, and was in consequence hereof observed by the patriarchs, is at least probable, from their distinguishing time by weeks of seven days, Gen. viii. 10—12; xxix. 27; for which it is not easy to account on any other supposition than of some positive divine appointment, there being no ground in nature for such a division.* The changes and quarters of the moon would not occasion it to be adopted, a lunar month being more than four times seven days, by above a day and a half.

It is a farther confirmation of this argument, that all heathen nations, many of whom cannot be supposed to have had any knowledge of the law or history of Moses, divided their time in the same manner as the patriarchs and the Jews did, by weeks of seven days. And it appears by their most ancient writers, Homer and Hesiod in particular, that they accounted one day of the seven more sacred than the rest. Hesiod styles the seventh day the illustrious light of the sun:

Ἑβδοματη δ' αυθις λαμπρον φαος ηελιοιο.

Homer saith,

Ἑβδοματη δ' ηπειτα γατηλυθεν ἱερον ἡμαρ.

Then came the seventh day, which is sacred or holy.†

Now, can we suppose they should all agree in this division of time, unless from a divine institution imparted to our first parents, from whom it was derived by tradition to their posterity.

Some have apprehended, as we have already observed, that "the end of the days," when Cain and Abel are said to have "brought their offerings to the Lord," Gen. iv. 3, means the end or last day of the week, that is, the sabbath day. But should this expression be thought to signify more probably the end of the year, when the fruits of the earth were ripe, it is not, however, unlikely that the day, when "the sons of God" are said in the book of Job to come to "present themselves before the Lord," chap. i. 6, was the sabbath, when pious per-

* See a remarkable passage, to this purpose, of Johannes Philoponus, in Witsii Ægypt. lib. iii. cap. ix. sect. ii. p. 241, 242.

† See Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. lib. v. p. 600, edit. Paris, 1641; et Selden. de Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. iii. cap. xvi.

sons (styled in Genesis "the sons of God," chap. vi. 2) assembled for public worship.

It is farther observed by Dr. Kennicott, that when the sabbath is first mentioned in the time of Moses, namely, in the sixteenth chapter of the book of Exodus, it is not spoken of as a novel institution, but as one with which the people were well acquainted: "To-morrow," saith he, "is the holy sabbath to the Lord:" and then he informs them, not of their general duty at such a season, of which they were perfectly apprised, but only how they should act on that day with respect to the manna, which was not to fall on the seventh, as it had done on the six preceding days.*

Indeed, it cannot be supposed that God left the world destitute of so salutary an institution, and consequently that no sabbath was observed for so many ages as intervened between Adam and Moses. The observation of a sabbath, of some particular season for rest and devotion, is primarily a moral law, or law of nature; certain intervals of respite from business and labour being necessary for the preservation both of our intellectual and corporeal frame; and it being highly reasonable, that those who are wholly dependent on God, from whom they receive many public as well as private blessings, should present him not only private but public and social worship, which cannot be done unless certain days or times are appointed, when they may assemble for that purpose.

And for this end the blessed God hath been pleased to establish a due proportion of time, namely, one day in seven. "God blessed the seventh day," it is said, "and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God created and made." He sanctified it, that is, he separated and distinguished it from the days of the week, setting it apart for the purposes of a sabbath, agreeably to the primary meaning of the verb קדש *kadhash, separavit,* or *consecravit.* What is meant by his "blessing the day," may be understood by the opposite phrase, "cursing a day." Both Job, chap. iii. 1, &c., and Jeremiah, chap. xx. 14, in the warmth and bitterness of their spirits, "cursed the day of their birth;" that is, wished no favourable or agreeable event might happen on

* Kennicott's Two Dissertations on the Tree of Life, and Oblations of Cain and Abel, dissert. ii. p. 141, Oxford, 1747.

that day, that it might not be a time of rejoicing, but of mourning: "Let the day be darkness; let a cloud dwell upon it; let no joyful voice come therein;" Job iii. 4, 5. 7. The Greeks had their *αποφραδες*,* and the Romans their *dies infausti*, that is, certain dyas which had been distinguished by some great calamity, on which, therefore, they did not indulge themselves in any mirth or pleasure, and expected no good event to happen to them. Tacitus relates, that the senate, to flatter Nero, decreed, "ut dies natalis Agrippinæ inter nefastos esset."† To bless a day, on the contrary, is to wish that it may prove happy, and to devote it to joy and pleasure. And, by God's blessing the seventh day, we are naturally to understand his appointing it to be a sacred festival, a day not only of rest but delight, as the sabbath is called by the prophet Isaiah, chap. lviii. 13; and perhaps it might have a farther respect to some happy event, which was afterward to happen on this day of the week, I mean the resurrection of Christ. For if, as we shall presently make appear to be probable, the Jewish sabbath was appointed to be kept the day before the patriarchal sabbath, then the first day of the week, or the Christian sabbath, is the seventh day, computed from the beginning of time, and the same with the sabbath instituted and observed by the patriarchs, in commemoration of the work of creation.

Thus much with respect to the patriarchal sabbath: as to the Jewish, we shall consider,

1st. The institution of it:

2dly. The duties that belonged to it: and,

3dly. The design and end of it.

First. As to the institution of the Jewish sabbath: The first account we have of it is in the sixteenth chapter of the Book of Exodus, where the day that God appointed to be kept by the Jews for their sabbath, was marked out by its not raining manna, which it had done for six days before; ver. 23—26. The observation of a sabbath was probably not wholly new to the Jews; it is not likely they had entirely omitted this weekly day of rest and devotion. Nevertheless,

* Lucian. Pseudologista seu *περι της αποφραδος*, præsertim ab init. cum not. Cognati in loc. etiam Lexico. Constantini in voc. *Αποφραδες ἡμεραι*.

† Annal lib. xiv. sect. xii. p. 289, edit. Glasg. 1743.

the manner of keeping the sabbath by a total cessation from labour, and the particular day on which it was to be kept by the Jews, seems to have been a new institution; otherwise, as to the day, there would have been no occasion for its being so particularly marked out by Moses, as the reason of there being a double quantity of manna on the sixth day (see verses 23. 25); for it must have immediately occurred to the people, that it was intended for their provision on the sabbath, if the next day had been the sabbath in course. And the expression which Moses useth is remarkable: "See," or take notice, "for that the Lord hath given you the sabbath" (as if this day were then first appointed to them), "therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days;" ver. 29. And it seems to have been too trivial a circumstance to be recorded in the sacred history, that the people "rested on the seventh day," ver. 30, if this had been merely what they and their fathers had always done.

It moreover appears, that that day week, before the day which was thus marked out for a sabbath by its not raining manna, was not observed as a sabbath. On the fifteenth day of the second month they journeyed from Elim, and came at night into the wilderness of Sin, ver. 1, where, on their murmuring for want of provisions, the Lord that night sent them quails: and the next morning, which was the sixteenth day, it rained manna, and so for six days successively; on the seventh, which was the twenty-second, it rained none, and that day they were commanded to keep for their sabbath; and if this had been the sabbath in course, according to the paradisiacal computation, the fifteenth must have been so too, and would have been doubtless kept as a sabbath, and not have been any part of it spent in marching from Elim to Sin.

Again, that the Jewish sabbath was on a different day from the paradisiacal is probable, from its being appointed as a sign between God and the people of Israel, by observing which they were to know or acknowledge Jehovah as their God: Exod. xxxi. 13. 17; Ezek. xx. 20. Agreeable to which is the opinion of the Jewish doctors, that the sabbath was given to the Israelites, and none else were bound to observe it. But how could it be a sign between God and the people of Israel, more than any other people, if it had been merely

the old paradisiacal sabbath, which had been given to all mankind?

The Jewish sabbath being declared to be instituted as a memorial of their deliverance out of the land of Egypt, and this being superadded to the reason for keeping the ancient paradisiacal sabbath, makes it highly probable it was appointed to be on a different day; otherwise, how could it be a memorial of a new event, or with what propriety could it be said, as it is, that because God "had brought them out of the land of Egypt, therefore he commanded them to keep the sabbath day?" Compare Exod. xx. 11, and Deut. v. 15. Some learned men have endeavoured to compute, that the Jewish sabbath was appointed on the same day of the week on which they left Egypt; or rather, on which their deliverance was completed by the overthrow of Pharoah in the Red Sea; but whether that computation can be clearly made out, or not, this new reason assigned for keeping the sabbath makes it very likely that it was so.

To the foregoing arguments it is replied,

1st. That the Israelites had probably lost the ancient sabbath during their slavery in Egypt, if not before;* for that it cannot be thought their Egyptian taskmasters would suffer them to rest from their labours one day in every week; and that therefore, the sabbath having been laid aside or forgot, the institution of the Jewish sabbath was only, by a new order, reviving the ancient sabbath.

But to this it may be answered, That if the Israelites had forgot the original sabbath, God certainly had not; and it is very improbable he would have commanded them to travel from Elim to Sin on the day he had consecrated to sacred rest, before he had either repealed the law of the sabbath, or declared his will that any alteration should be made in it. For the children of Israel never journeyed, but at the command of God: Exod. xiii. 21; Numb. ix. 18.

Again, it is not probable the Egyptians would be so blind to their own interest, as by subjecting the Israelites to excessive and incessant labour, to wear out and destroy their

* This was the opinion of Philo, de Vitâ Mosis, p. 491, E, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

constitutions.* It is more likely they allowed them a weekly day of rest, as is allowed by their masters to the negroes in the West Indies, more for the sake of their health, than out of any regard to religion.

But if there is reason to believe, that the Egyptians themselves observed the ancient paradisiacal sabbath, it is still more probable they would allow the Israelites to do the same; and as the Egyptians and other heathens received the law of the sabbath by tradition from Noah and Adam, it is reasonable to suppose they kept the day of the week originally appointed; for what should alter it, as long as men measured their time by a regular succession of weeks, but a new divine institution?

It is a very probable conjecture, that the day which the heathens in general consecrated to the worship and honour of their chief god, the sun, which, according to our computation, was the first day of the week, was the ancient paradisiacal sabbath. What, but the tradition of a divine institution, should induce them to consecrate that day to their principal deity, and to esteem it more sacred than any other?

The reason, perhaps, for God's changing the day might be to take off the Israelites more effectually from concurring with the Gentiles in their idolatrous worship of the sun. For the same reason, as the heathens begun their sabbath, and other days, from the sun-rising, the Israelities are ordered to begin their sabbaths from the sun-setting, Lev. xxiii. 32; "From evening to evening shall ye celebrate your sabbath." As the worshippers of the sun adored toward the east, the point of the sun's rising, God ordered the most holy place, in which were the sacred symbols of his presence in the tabernacle and temple, and toward which the people were to worship, to be placed to the west.

2dly. It is objected, that the paradisiacal sabbath was appointed to be kept on the seventh day; and so, in the fourth commandment, was the Jewish; and they are supposed, therefore, to have been kept on the same day. But this consequence will not follow from the premises. It is by no means certain, that the seventh day of the Jewish week coincided

* See Selden, de Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. iii. cap. xiii. Oper. vol. i. tom. i. p. 344.

with the seventh of the paradisiacal. For, upon their migration out of Egypt, God appointed the Israelites a quite new computation of time. The beginning of the year was changed from the month Tizri to the opposite month Abib, Exod. xii. 2; and the beginning of the day from the morning to the evening; for whereas the fifteenth day of the month, on which they departed from Egypt, was reckoned to be the morrow after the evening in which they eat the passover, that is, on the fourteenth day (Numb. xxxiii. 3, compared with Exod. xii. 6), they were, for the time to come, to compute their days, at least their sabbaths, from evening to evening: by this means the fifteenth day was changed into the fourteenth, and the seventh into the sixth; and the change of the sabbath made a change likewise of the beginning of the week, it always beginning the next day after the sabbath, which was still the seventh day of the week, or the seventh in respect of the preceding six of labour, though not the seventh from the beginning of time.

We may farther observe, that the law of the sabbath is limited, not only to the people of Israel, but to the duration of their state and polity. "Thy children shall observe the sabbath throughout their generations," Exod. xxxi. 16; that is, as long as their political constitution should endure, to the days of the Messiah, so long the sabbath was to be kept for a "perpetual covenant," without interruption, and was to be "a sign between God and the children of Israel for ever," ver. 17, or while they were his peculiar people, and only visible church in the world. In the same sense the priesthood of Aaron and his sons is called an everlasting priesthood, chap. xl. 15; and God promised that he would give to the seed of Abraham all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession; Gen. xvii. 8.

This law, or institution of the sabbath, was enforced by the threatening of capital punishment to such as violated it: "Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death; and whoever doth any work thereon, that soul shall surely be cut off from among his people;" Exod. xxxi. 14. These two clauses of the threatening are generally understood in the following manner: "The first, as referring to any open violation

of the sabbath; which was to be punished by the magistrate with death, but it was not yet declared by what kind of death. Accordingly, a person being afterward convicted of this crime, he was put in ward, "because it was not declared what should be done to him;" Numb. xv. 34. And God being afresh consulted on this occasion, it was now determined the execution for this offence should be by stoning; ver. 35. The second clause of the threatening, "that soul should be cut off from among his people," is commonly supposed to relate to secret violations of the sabbath, of which there being no witnesses, they could not be punished by the magistrate; and therefore they should be punished by the immediate hand of God. The same phrase is used concerning the punishment of incestuous and unlawful conjunctions, which are generally practised secretly, and therefore can be punished by none but God; see Lev. xviii. 29.

Thus much for the institution of the Jewish sabbath. We now proceed,

Secondly, To consider the duties that belonged to it; which are, to remember to keep it holy, to abstain from all work and worldly business on that day, and to sanctify it.

The first duty of the sabbath is to remember to keep it holy, Exod. xx. 8, which may import two things:

1st. The commemoration of blessings formerly received: and,

2dly. Preparing themselves for the due observance of it.

1st. The word "remember" hath naturally a retrospect to those former blessings which they were particularly to recollect and commemorate on the sabbath. And they were chiefly two,—God's creating the world, and his delivering their nation from bondage in Egypt. The first was a blessing common to the Jews and the rest of mankind; and is accordingly assigned as the reason of God's appointing a sabbath to be kept by Adam and all his posterity; Gen. ii. 3. This reason, therefore, for the observation of the sabbath was not peculiar to the Jews, but common to them and all others, on whatever day it was kept. But besides this reason mentioned in the book of Exodus, on occasion of the institution of the Jewish sabbath, chap. xx. 11, there was a farther reason assigned in the book

of Deuteronomy, chap. v. 15, which was peculiar to themselves, namely, their deliverance from their bondage in the land of Egypt.

2dly. To "remember the sabbath to keep it holy," may farther imply, that they should not forget to prepare themselves beforehand for the right observance of it. The sabbath began at six, the preparation at three o'clock in the afternoon, and then they got every thing in readiness, for which they had occasion, and the procuring or providing which was prohibited on the sabbath, or inconsistent with the strictness which the law required on that holy day. The whole preceding day, according to Godwin, was a kind of preparation, which, saith he, will appear by the particulars then forbidden: First, on this day they might go no more than three *parsas*, ten of which a man might go in an ordinary day: Secondly, judges might not sit in judgment upon life and death: Thirdly, all sorts of artificers were forbidden to work, three only accepted, shoemakers, tailors, and scribes, who were allowed to employ themselves during half the time allotted for preparation, the two former in repairing apparel, the last in getting ready to expound the law.*

It was usual to give notice of the approach of the sabbath, by blowing the trumpet from some high place.† Rhenferd concludes, that the מוסך השבת *mussak hassabath*, or, as our version renders it, the covert for the sabbath, which king Ahaz took away from the temple, 2 Kings xvi. 18, was some kind of watch-tower, from the top of which the priests used to proclaim in this manner the approach of the sabbath.‡ But it may as well signify a canopy, under which the king used to sit in the court or porch of the temple on the sabbath-day, which Ahaz probably took away, to express his contempt of the sabbath, and his not intending to come to the temple any more.

The second duty of the sabbath was to abstain from all manner of work or business; from the labour of their trades

* Concerning the preparation for the sabbath, see Buxtorfi Synag. Judaic. cap. xv.

† Maimon. in Tract. Sabbath, cap. v. sect. xviii. xix.; Leusden. Philolog. Hebræo-mixt. dissert. xxxvi. sub fin.

‡ Vid. Rhenferd. opus Philolog. dissert. xviii.

and callings, Exod. xxxi. 15; buying and selling, Nehem. x. 31; carrying burdens, Jer. xvii. 21; and travelling. The law enjoins, that "no man should go out of his place on the sabbath-day," Exod. xvi. 29, which could not be meant to confine them to their houses, since the sabbath was to be celebrated by a holy convocation, Lev. xxiii. 3, or by the people's assembling for public worship. It can only, therefore, be understood as forbidding them to travel any farther than was necessary for that purpose; how far that might be, the law does not determine, but leaves it to every one's discretion, according as the synagogue or place of worship, when the Jews came to be settled in Canaan, might be nearer or more remote. But the rabbies, the expounders of the law, have fixed it at two thousand cubits,* or about two-thirds of an English mile. This they ground, partly on Joshua's appointing the space of two thousand cubits between the ark and the people, when they marched into Canaan, Josh. iii. 4, and partly, on two thousand cubits being assigned for the suburbs of the cities of the Levites all around them, Numb. xxxv. 5; beyond which, say they, it was not lawful for them to travel on the sabbath-day. The Chaldee Paraphrase, on Ruth i. 16, says, "Naomi said unto Ruth, we are commanded to keep the sabbath and good days, and not to go above two thousand cubits." The same measure is assigned in the Babylonish Talmud.† This, in all probability, was the distance of Mount Olivet from Jerusalem, it being said, Acts i. 12, to be a sabbath-day's journey.‡

Again, the Jews were forbid "doing and finding their own pleasure on the sabbath;" which, I conceive, is to be understood of recreations and diversions; and "speaking their own words," that is, talking about worldly matters, making bargains, &c.; Isa. lviii. 13.

They were likewise forbid kindling fires in their habitations

* Vid. Meyer. de Temporibus et Festis Diebus Hebræor. part ii. cap. ix. sect. xxxix. xl. p. 188. 190; Hottinger. Juris Hebræor. Leges, leg. xxiv. p. 32—34; Lightfoot, Horæ Hebraic. in Luc. xxiv. 50, et Act. x. 12.

† Cod. Gnerubin, fol. 48, 1, et fol. 51, 1; Vid. Meyer. Hottinger. et Lightfoot, ubi supra.

‡ See Voightii Dissert. de Viâ Sabbathi; et Waltheri Dissert. de Itinere Sabbathi, in Act. i. 12, apud Thesaur. Theolog. Philolog. tom. ii. p. 417, et seq. p. 423, et seq. Amstel. 1702.

on the sabbath-day; Exod. xxxv. 3. This law, it is supposed, was not intended to prohibit their having fires on the sabbath, to keep them warm in cold weather, but only to dress their meat, or for any other work. They were to dress their victuals for the sabbath the day before, that no servile labour, or as little as possible, might be done on the day itself, and that their servants might rest as well as themselves; chap. xvi. 23. Nay, the sabbatical rest was ordered to extend even to the beasts of labour; they were not to be set to work on that day; chap. xx. 10. The ancient doctors inculcated the rest of the sabbath with a very superstitious rigour, forbidding even all acts of self-defence on that day, though assaulted by their enemies. Upon this principle a thousand Jews suffered themselves to be slain on the sabbath, not making the least resistance, in the beginning of the Maccabean wars;* 1 Mac. ii. 31—38. Upon which Mattathias and his followers reflecting, that if they went on to act upon this principle, they must all be destroyed in like manner, decreed, upon a full debate of the matter, that for the future, if they were assaulted on the sabbath, they should defend themselves, and it was lawful for them so to do; ver. 39—41.† However, though they would defend themselves against a direct attack, they would do nothing to hinder the enemy's works; which Pompey observing, as he was besieging Jerusalem in favour of Hyrcanus against his brother Aristobulus, ordered that no assault should be made on the sabbath, but that the day should be employed by his army in carrying on their works, such as filling up the ditches with which the temple was fortified, placing their battering engines, &c., by which means he took the city, and brought the Jews under subjection to the Romans, who at length took away both their place and nation.‡ Thus their traditionary precepts, by which in many cases they made void the law of God, proved, in the end, to be one means of their utter destruction.

Nevertheless, the modern or rabbinical doctors have regarded the rest of the sabbath, if possible, more superstitiously still: they advance thirty-nine negative precepts concerning

* Joseph. lib. xii. cap. vi. sect. ii. p. 612, edit. Haverc.

† Joseph. ubi supra, et sect. iii.

‡ Joseph. Antiq. lib. xiv. cap. iv. sect. ii.—iv. p. 689; see the story in Prideaux's Connect. part ii. book vi. sub anno 63, vol. iv. p. 620, 621.

things not to be done on that day, besides many others which are appendages to them. Two of these may serve as a specimen of the whole: grass might not be walked upon, lest it should be bruised, which is a sort of threshing: and a flea must not be caught, while it hops about, because that is a kind of hunting. They acquaint us also with many positive precepts which run much in the same strain; that they should put on clean linen, wear better clothes than on any other day, eat once in six hours,* &c. But the true key for understanding the law of God concerning the sabbatical rest was given us by our Saviour, when he said, "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath," Mark ii. 27: it was intended for his benefit, for his rest and religious improvement, and not as a yoke of bondage, restraining him from works of necessity or mercy. And this leads to the consideration of

The third duty of the sabbath, which is, to "sanctify it;" Deut. v. 12. It is inquired what this means? Some would have it to import no more than abstaining from work and labour. Le Clerc contends for this opinion, and alleges in support of it, the following passage of Jeremiah: "Neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the sabbath-day, neither do ye any work; but hallow ye the sabbath-day, as I commanded your fathers;" chap. xvii. 22. 24. Doing no work on the sabbath, and hallowing or sanctifying it, are plainly used as expressions of the same import. As for what is called in Leviticus "the holy convocation to be kept on the sabbath," chap. xxiii. 3, he supposes it means what the Greeks call *πανηγυρις*, an assembly for feasting and pleasure.† Vitringa espouses the same sentiment.‡ The Jewish doctors are of a contrary opinion; they make the sanctification of the sabbath to consist, not merely in rest and idleness, but in meditation on the wonderful works of God, in the study of the law, and

* Munster. in Exod. xx. 2; Mishn. tom. ii. tit. Sabbath; Maimon. tract. Sabbath, passim; Leusden. Philolog. Hebræo-mixt. dissert. xxxiv. xxxv. de Sabbatho, præsertim, sect. vi. p. 235, 2d edit.; and Buxtorf. de Synag. Judaic. cap. xv. p. 322, cap. xvi. p. 351—364, edit Basil. 1661.

† Clerici Comment. in Exod. xx. 8.

‡ De Synag. Vetere, lib. i. part ii. cap. ii. especially p. 289—294. Spencer maintains the same opinion, De Legibus Hebræor. lib. i. cap. v. sect viii.—x. vol. i. p. 67—88, edit. Cantab. 1727.

in instructing those who are under them.* They tell us farther, that the ninety-second Psalm was composed by Adam for the devotion of this day.† We shall not insist on the last particular; in other respects their opinion seems to be agreeable to Scripture and the reason of things, because,

1st. The word sanctify, applied either to persons or things, usually imports not only the separation of them from common use, but the dedication of them to the more immediate service of God. To sanctify the sabbath, therefore, according to the true import of the word, is not only to refrain from common business, but to spend the day in the peculiar service of God, or in religious exercises and acts of devotion.

2dly. Double sacrifices being appointed to be offered on the sabbath, Numb. xxviii. 9, 10, is an intimation that it was intended to be a day of extraordinary devotion.

3dly. The מקראי קדש *mikre kodhesh*, or holy convocations to be held on the sabbath, Lev. xxiii. 3, are most naturally to be understood of assemblies for religious worship; as in the following passage of Isaiah: "The Lord will create upon every dwelling-place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, מקראי קדש *mikre kodhesh*, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night;" chap. iv. 5.‡

4thly. That such religious assemblies were anciently held on the sabbath is argued from the Shunamite's husband inquiring of her why she wanted to go to the prophet's house, when it was neither new moon nor sabbath? 2 Kings iv. 23. Which seems to imply, that it was customary to go to his house on sabbath-days; and it may reasonably be supposed to be for the sake of religious worship performed there, when probably the prophet preached for the instruction of the people.

This may likewise be inferred with great probability from the following passage of the Acts: "Moses, of old time,§ hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath-day;" chap. xv. 21.

* Vid. Meyer. de Temporibus et Festis, part ii. cap. ix. sect. lx. et seq. p. 197, &c.; Christoph. Cartwright. Electa Targum. Rabbin. in Exod. xx. 8.

† See the title of this Psalm in the Chaldee Paraphrase.

‡ See above, p. 365.

§ Γενεων αρχαιων, from ancient generations, or the first ages. Vid. Marckii Syllog. Dissertat. Philolog. Theolog. exercitat. xvi. sect. vii. p. 454, 455. Rotterod. 1721.

5thly. We may argue, with Manasseh Ben-Israel, that, as idleness is usually productive of a great deal of evil, if the institution of the sabbath had been merely to render people idle one day in the week, it would have been very hurtful instead of beneficial.*

Upon the whole, we conclude, that the sabbath was to be sanctified by acts of devotion, and especially by meeting together in solemn assemblies for public worship. Of this opinion is Josephus, who mentions it as an excellent institution of Moses, that, not thinking it sufficient for the Israelites to hear the law once or twice, or oftener, he commanded them every week to lay aside all worldly business, and to assemble in public to hear the law read and expounded.† Philo saith much the same thing.‡

Thirdly. In the last place we are to consider the ends for which the sabbath was instituted, which were partly political and partly religious.

1st. There is a political end assigned for this institution; namely, that the beasts of burden, as well as servants and other labouring people, might be refreshed by resting one day in seven, which would be a means of recruiting their vigour and preserving their health: "That thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid and the stranger may be refreshed;" Exod. xxiii. 12. Some of the Jewish doctors, by the servants that were to rest on the sabbath-day, understand only such as were circumcised. Uncircumcised slaves, they say, might work on the sabbath, as an Israelite might on any other day.§ Whereas the weekly rest, extending to the labouring beast, surely much more included all labouring servants, of whatever religious denomination. By the way, this may suggest a good reason why the civil magistrate, whose province is not religion, but merely the civil weal, should nevertheless maintain the observation of the sabbath, because

* Manass. Conciliat. in Exod. quæst. xxxv. See the passage at large in Cartwright, ubi supra.

† Joseph. contra Appion. lib. ii. sect. xvii. p. 483; see also, Antiq. lib. xvi. cap. ii. sect. iv. p. 788, edit. Haverc.

‡ Philo in Vit. Mosis, lib. iii. p. 529, 530, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

§ Maimon. de Sabbato, cap. xx. sect. xiv. See Ainsworth on Exod. xx. 10.

a weekly day of rest is evidently conducive to the civil and national welfare.

2dly. The religious reason for this institution was twofold; partly to keep up a thankful remembrance of blessings already received, and partly to be a means of their obtaining and enjoying future and heavenly blessings.

The blessings already received, of which the sabbath was instituted to be a memorial, were chiefly two,—their creation, and their deliverance from bondage in Egypt.

1st. It was appointed to be kept in memory of God's creating the world, which is the reason assigned for the first institution, Gen. ii. 2, 3, because "on the seventh day God ended his work, which he had made," or, as the word ויכל *vaichal* should rather be rendered, "he had ended his work," for he did not work on the seventh day; it follows, "he rested on the seventh day from all his works which he had made, and blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work." This, however, is not to be understood of his ceasing from any farther operation and action, the contrary to which our Saviour asserts: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," John v. 17; that is, in preserving, ordering, and governing the world. It is therefore commonly understood to mean, that he ceased from creating any new sorts or species of creatures; so that his power has ever since been exerted only in continuing and increasing the several species which he formed on the first six days. And certain it is, no instance can be given of any new sort or species having been since brought into being. Though various kinds of mules have been produced by creatures of different species, both in the animal and vegetable world, yet such are not to be reckoned distinct species, since none of them ever propagate their kind.

As for God's resting, we are not to understand it as opposed to toil or weariness; for "the Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not, neither is weary;" Isa. xl. 28. But it merely imports his ceasing to work as he had done for the preceding six days. Thus the word שבת *shabath* is used for the manna's ceasing to fall, Josh. v. 12, and for the Israelites ceasing to be a nation; Jer. xxxi. 36. Nevertheless, it may probably import likewise, the complacency or delight which

he took in the works he had made, which were "all very good;" since, in the twentieth chapter of Exodus, God's resting on the seventh day is expressed by the verb נוח *nuach*, ver. 11; the same word which is used for his acceptance of Noah's sacrifice; "The Lord smelt a savour of rest," or, as we render it, "a sweet savour," Gen. viii. 21; importing, that his thankfulness and devotion, expressed by his sacrifice, were as grateful to God as sweet odours are to us. To preserve, therefore, a remembrance of his creating the world in six days, and his resting from his work on the seventh, God instituted a weekly sabbath, commanding men to work six days, and to lay aside all their worldly employments on the seventh. And no doubt the right remembrance of God's creating power, wisdom, and goodness, must include adoration, thankfulness, and praise to the great Creator.

2dly. The other blessing, which the Jews in particular were to commemorate, was their deliverance out of the Egyptian bondage; which is mentioned as the special reason of their being commanded to keep the sabbath; Deut. v. 15. The learned Mr. Mede endeavours to prove the seventh day of the Jewish week, which was appointed for the sabbath, to be the day on which God overthrew Pharaoh in the Red Sea, and thereby completed the deliverance of his people from the Egyptian servitude. And whereas a seventh day had before been kept in memory of the creation (but to what day of the Jewish week that answered we cannot certainly say), now God commanded them to observe for the future this day of their deliverance, which was the seventh day of their week, in commemoration of his having given them rest from their hard labour and servitude in Egypt.* And both these reasons for their observing the sabbath implied their obligation to observe it with devotion, gratitude, and praise.

The other religious end of the sabbath was to be a means of their obtaining and enjoying future and heavenly blessings. This is a principal design of all acts of devotion and worship; such as we have already shown ought to accompany the observance of the sabbath. The Jews accounted this holy day to be a type of the heavenly rest. On this notion the apostle evidently grounds his discourse in the fourth chapter of the

* Mede's Diatrib. on Ezek. xx. 10.

Epistle to the Hebrews, ver. 1—11. Origen makes the sabbath an emblem of that rest we shall enjoy when we have done our work, so as to have left nothing undone which was our incumbent duty.* In the same manner the Jewish doctors speak of the sabbath. It was a common proverb among them,† "Non datum est sabbatum, nisi ut esset typus futuri seculi." Remarkable to the same purpose are the words of Abarbanel:‡ "Sabbata dixit in plurali numero, quandoquidem præceptum de sabbato non solum designat fundamentalem illum articulum de creatione mundi, verum etiam, mundum spiritualem, in quo erit vera quies, et vera possessio. Illic vera cessatio erit, ab omnibus operibus et rebus corporeis. Habemus ergo duo sabbata, unum corporale, in memoriam creationis, alterum spirituale, in memoriam immortalitatis animæ et oblectationis post mortem." The Jews, therefore, by no means count the sabbath a burden, but a great blessing: they have it in high veneration, and affect to call it their spouse.§ Leo of Modena tells us, that so far are the modern Jews from being inclined to shorten the sabbath, that they make it last as long as possible, prolonging their hymns and prayers, not only out of devotion to God, but charity to the souls of the damned, it being a received opinion among them, that they suffer no torments on the sabbath.‖

* Origen. contra Celsum, lib. vi. p. 317, edit. Spencer. Cantab. 1677.

† Vid. Buxtorf. Florileg. Hebr. p. 299.

‡ On Exod. xxxi. 13.

§ Selden. de Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. iii. cap. x. Oper. vol. i. p. 326, 327; Buxtorf. Synag. Judaic. cap. xv. p. 299, 300, edit. Basil. 1661.

‖ On the subject of the sabbath, consult Selden, de Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. iii. cap. viii. et seq.; Capelli Disputatio de Sabbatho, apud Comment. et Not. Critic. in Vet. Test. p. 263, et seq. Amstel. 1689; Spencer, de Leg. Hebr. lib. i. cap. v. sect. vii. et seq.

CHAPTER IV.

OF THE PASSOVER AND FEAST OF UNLEAVENED BREAD.

The Jewish festivals were either weekly, as the sabbath; monthly, as the new moons; or annual, as the passover, the pentecost, the feast of ingathering or of tabernacles, and the feast of trumpets; to which we may add the annual fast, or day of expiation. Besides these, there were others that returned once in a certain number of years; as the sabbatical year, and the jubilee.

Of the anniversary feasts, the three former were the most considerable, the passover, the pentecost, and the feast of tabernacles. At each of these all the males were to appear before the Lord at the national altar: Exod. xxiii. 14. 17; xxxiv. 22, 23; Deut. xvi. 16. The design of this was, partly, to unite the Jews among themselves, and to promote mutual love and friendship throughout the nation, by means of the whole body of them meeting together so often: to which the Psalmist seems to refer, when he saith, "Jerusalem is builded as a city that is compact together: whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the Lord, unto the testimony of Israel, to give thanks unto the name of the Lord;" Psalm cxxii. 3, 4. And it was, partly, that as one church they might make one congregation, and join in solemn worship together; for I apprehend the Scripture idea of one particular church is only one worshipping assembly. And it was farther, by so large an appearance and concourse of people, to grace these sacred festivals, and add greater solemnity to the worship; and, partly, likewise, for the better support of the service and ministers of the sanctuary; for none were to appear before the Lord empty, each person was to bring some gift or present with him, according to his ability, and as God had blessed him; Deut. xvi. 16, 17. Farther, as the Jewish sanctuary and service contained in them a shadow of good things to

come, and were typical of the gospel church, this prescribed concourse from all parts of the country to the sanctuary might be intended to typify the gathering of the people to Christ, and into his church, from all parts of the world, under the Christian dispensation. Hence the apostle, in allusion to these general assemblies of the Israelites on the three grand feasts, saith, "We are come to the general assembly and church of the first-born;" Heb. xii. 23.

The law required only the males to appear before the Lord on these solemn occasions. But, though the women were exempted from a necessity of attending, yet they were not excluded if they pleased to do it, and could with convenience; as appears from the case of Hannah, who used to go with her husband yearly to worship and sacrifice to the Lord of Hosts in Shiloh, 1 Sam. i. 3. 7; and from the case of the Virgin Mary, who went with her husband Joseph every year at the feast of the passover to Jerusalem; Luke ii. 41. Mr. Mede assigns three reasons for the women's being exempted from the duty of attending the feasts:—

1st. The weakness and infirmity of the sex, they not being able, without much trouble and danger, to undertake so long a journey from the remote parts of the country.

2dly. The hazard of their chastity in so vast a concourse of people.

3dly. The care of their young children, and other household affairs, which must have been wholly abandoned if they, as well as the men, had been absent from their houses so long at the same time.*

To these reasons probably another and more considerable may be added, namely, the legal uncleannesses to which they would be liable in so long a journey.

Though the law required all the males to appear before the Lord, in the place he should choose, at these three feasts; no doubt it was to be understood with some restriction, it not being likely that young children or decrepit old men could give their attendance.† Mr. Mede‡ conceives the law is to

* Mede's Diatrib. discourse xlvii. on Deut. xvi. 16, Works, p. 261.

† These, among others, are expressly excepted, Mishn. tit. Chagigah, cap. i. sect. i. tom. ii. p. 413, edit. Surenhus.; see also the Gemara in loc.

‡ Mede, ubi supra.

be understood of all males within the age of service from twenty to fifty years old; for at fifty all were *emeriti*, even the priests and Levites serve not after that age: but as to the age at which persons entered on service, that was different; the priests might not serve before thirty, nor the Levites before twenty-five; but the laity were capable of employment at twenty, as appears from a passage in Numbers, where God commands Moses "to take the sum of all the congregation of the children of Israel, from twenty years old and upwards, all that were able to go forth to war;" Numb. i. 3. But if, according to the rabbies, children came under the obligation of the law when they were twelve years old, this perhaps was the age of their attendance at these festivals: which opinion is somewhat countenanced by the history of Jesus going with his parents to Jerusalem at the passover when he was twelve years old; Luke ii. 42.* But I take the more probable opinion to be, that all the males meant all that were capable of taking the journey† and of attending the feast, which some were able to do sooner and some later in life; and therefore by the law no age was fixed, but it was left to be determined by every one's prudence and religious zeal; only none might absent themselves without sufficient reason.

There are yet two difficulties, which have been started concerning this law. One is, how Jerusalem could contain such multitudes as flocked from all parts of Judea to these solemnities. The other is, how the Israelites could leave their towns and villages destitute of men, without the greatest danger of being invaded and plundered by their neighbouring enemies.

As to the former question, it may as well be asked, how it is possible for Bath and Tunbridge to contain such multitudes as flock to them in their seasons. For, as at those places there are great numbers of lodging-houses, much larger than are requisite for the accommodation of the families that constantly inhabit them; so it was doubtless at Jerusalem, to which there were every year three stated seasons of concourse from all parts of the country. It is probable, that most families let lodgings at those times. The man at whose house our Saviour eat his last passover with his disciples, had a "guest-chamber," or a room which he spared on these occa-

* Lightfoot, Hor. Hebraic. in loc. † Vid. Mishn. ubi supra.

sions; Luke xxii. 11. Or if this be not sufficient to remove the difficulty, it is an easy supposition, that many might be entertained in tents erected on these occasions; as the Mohammedan pilgrims are at Mecca, to which many thousands resort at a certain time of the year.

As to the other difficulty, concerning the danger of leaving their towns and villages without any men to guard them, we need not have recourse to the conjecture advanced by some, that this obligation on all the males was only during their abode in the wilderness, when their nearness to the tabernacle easily admitted of their attendance. If that had been the case, Jeroboam need not have set up the golden calves at Dan and Bethel, to deliver the ten tribes from going up to Jerusalem to worship; 1 Kings xii. 27, 28. Beside, there are sufficient instances in the Jewish history to show, that this practice was continued till after our Saviour's time. Thus we are informed in the Acts, that there were multitudes of Jews, out of every nation under heaven, come to Jerusalem at the feast of pentecost; chap. ii. 5. Κατοικουντες, which our version renders "dwelling" at Jerusalem, should in this place be rendered "abiding," that is, during the time of the festival. Κατοικησις is used by St. Mark for a place of transient abode, and not a fixed and settled habitation; chap. v. 3.

Nor need we suppose with others, that they only sent a certain proportion of men, as one in ten or twelve, to Jerusalem, to be as it were the representatives, and offer the gifts of the rest, while they kept the feasts in their own towns. Nor need we, again, suppose with others, that since there was a divine permission granted to those who were unable to celebrate the passover in the first month, to do it in the second, Numb. ix. 10, 11, the same indulgence might probably extend to the other festivals; and so one half of the males might stay at home and guard the country and their houses, while the other half went to the sanctuary; and those who thus remained behind might celebrate the festival in the next month.

We need, I say, none of these suppositions and conjectures, since God himself had expressly undertaken to guard their habitations and substance, by his special providence, while the men were absent to celebrate the sacred festivals: "Nei-

ther shall any man desire thy land," it is said, "when thou shalt go up to appear befor the Lord thy God thrice in the year;" Exod. xxxiv. 24. This is, by the way, a very remarkable instance of the sovereign and absolute power which God exercises over the hearts and spirits of men. Accordingly, we find not in the whole Scripture history, that any such evil ever befel the Israelites on these occasions; insomuch that though in many other cases they were backward in believing God's promises; yet, at these seasons, they would leave their habitations and families without the least apprehension of danger.

Having thus considered a circumstance which was common to the three grand anniversary feasts, we are now to treat of the first of them, namely, the passover.

Of the institution of this festival we have an account in the twelfth chapter of the book of Exodus. It is called in the Hebrew פסחא *pascha*, from פסח *pasach, transiit*. In the Greek it is called πασχα, but not from the verb πασχω, *patior*, to suffer, on account of Christ's having suffered at the time of this feast, according to the illiterate supposition of Chrysostom, Irenæus, and Tertullian. Chrysostom saith, Πασχα λεγεται, ὁτι τοτε επαθεν ὁ Χριστος ὑπερ ἡμων: "Pascha dicitur, quia Christus illo tempore pro nobis passus est."* Irenæus saith, "A Moyse ostenditur Filius Dei, cujus et diem passionis non ignoravit, sed figuratim pronunciavit, eum pascha nominans."† Tertullian, "Hanc solemnitatem——præcanebat (sc. Moyses) et adjecit, Pascha esse Domini, id est, passionem Christi."‡ But the Greek word πασχα is derived from the Chaldee פסחא *pascha*,§ which answers to the Hebrew פסח *pesach*: and the festival was so called, not from its being prophetical or typical of Christ's sufferings, but from God's passing over and leaving in safety the houses of the Israelites, on the door-posts of which the blood of the sacri-

* Homil. v. in 1 Tim.

† Iren. adversus Hær. lib. iv. cap. xxiii. p. 309, edit. Grabii, Oxon. 1702.

‡ Tertullian adversus Judæos, cap. x. sub. fin. p. 197, A, edit. Rigalt. Paris, 1675.

§ Philo in Vitâ Mosis, lib. iii. p. 531, A, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613, το χαλδαιστι λεγομενον πασχα. In his treatise De Decalogo, he saith, ην (sc. εορτην) Ἑβραιοι πατριῳ γλωττῃ πασχα προσαγορευουσιν, p. 591, C.

ficed lamb was sprinkled, when he slew the first-born in all the houses of the Egyptians. This etymology of the name is expressly given in the book of Exodus: "It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover," אשר פסח *asher pasach*, who passed by, or leaped over, the houses of the Israelites; chap. xii. 27. So that our English word passover well expresses the true import of the original פסח *pesach*, or פסחא *pascha*..

Concerning the passover we shall consider,

1st. The time when it was to be kept:

2dly. The rites with which it was to be celebrated:

3dly. The signification of these rites.

First. The time when this feast was to be celebrated, is very particularly expressed in Leviticus, "in the fourteenth day of the first month, at even, is the Lord's passover," chap. xxiii. 5; wherein is remarked the month, the day, and the time of the day.

1st. The month. It is called the first month, that is, of the ecclesiastical year, which commenced with the Israelites' fligh tout of Egypt; Exod. xii. 2. This month had two names; Abib, chap. xiii. 4, and Nisan, Nehem. ii. 1; Esth. iii. 7. It is called Abib, that is, the earing month, or the month of new corn, for *abib* signifies a green or new ear of corn, such as was grown to maturity, but not dried or fit for grinding. In the second chapter of Leviticus the offering of the first-fruits is called *abib*, and it is ordered to be dried by the fire, in order to its being beaten or ground into flour, ver. 14 Eng., 13. Heb.; and in the ninth chapter of Exodus the barley is said to be smitten with hail, because it was *abib*, ver. 31; that is, in the ear. Hence the Septuagint translates *abib*, wherever it is used for the name of a month, μηνα των νεων, understanding, no doubt, καρπων. So the Vulgate also ren ders it, "mensis novarum frugum."

The other name, Nisan, is derived by some from נוס *nus*, *fugere;* and so it signifies the month of flight, namely, of the Israelites out of Egypt. Others derive it from נס *nes*, *vexillum*, or נסס *nasas*, *vexillum tulit;* and so it signifies the month of war, when campaigns usually began. Perhaps "the time when kings go forth to battle," a phrase used in the Second Book of Samuel, chap. xi. 1, may only be a periphrasis for the month Nisan. Thus the Romans called this

month Martius, "quasi mensis Marti sacer:" the Bithynians styled the two first spring months στρατειος and ερειος, from Αρης, Mars, the god of war.* But there are others who derive it from the Arabic and Syriac word נוס *nus, conturbatus est,* because it is usually a stormy month.

Secondly. As to the day of the month, when this feast was to begin, it was ordered to be on the fourteenth at even, at which time the paschal lamb was to be killed and eaten, and from thence the feast was to be kept seven days, till the twenty-first: Exod. xii. 6. 8. 15; Lev. xxiii. 5, 6. Sacrifices, peculiar to this festival, were to be offered on each of the seven days; but the first and last, namely, the fifteenth and the twenty-first, were to be sanctified above all the rest, as sabbaths, by abstaining from all servile labour, and holding a holy convocation, Exod. xii. 16; Lev. xxiii. 7, 8; especially the seventh or last day was called חג ליהוה *chag Laiovah,* "a feast unto the Lord," κατ' εξοχην, Exod. xiii. 6, and עצרת ליהוה *gnatsereth Laiovah,* which we render "a solemn assembly," Deut. xvi. 8; but עצרת *gnatsereth,* from עצר *gnatsar, clausit vel cohibuit,* rather signifies a restraint from all worldly business and servile labour.

The reason of the first and seventh day being thus peculiarly consecrated above the rest is, by Bochart, supposed to be, because the first was the day of the Israelites' escape out of Egypt, and the seventh that on which Pharaoh and his army were destroyed in the Red Sea.† But the special holiness of the first and the last day being a circumstance common to the feast of tabernacles, as well as the passover (Lev. xxiii. 39; John vii. 37), for this reason others think it was intended to signify in general, that we should persevere in the diligent prosecution of the business of religion to the end of our lives, and, instead of growing more remiss, should be the more active and vigorous, the nearer we arrive to the period of our race, to our heavenly rest and reward: agreeable to the exhortation of St. Peter,—"Wherefore, seeing ye look for such things, be diligent, that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless," 2 Pet. iii. 14; and of the author of the

* Bochart. Hieroz. lib. ii. cap. 1. Oper. tom. ii. p. 557, 558, edit. Lugd. Bat. 1712.

† Hierozoic. ubi supra, p. 602.

Epistle to the Hebrews,—"exhorting one another so much the more, as ye see the day approaching;" chap. x. 25.

Although the whole time of the continuance of this feast is in a more lax sense styled the passover, John xviii. 39; Luke xxii. 1; yet, strictly speaking, the passover was kept only on the evening of the fourteenth day of the month, and the ensuing seven days were the feast of unleavened bread; so called because during their continuance the Jews were to eat unleavened bread, and to have no other in their houses. This distinction between the passover and the feast of unleavened bread is made in the Second Book of Chronicles: "The children of Israel kept the passover, and the feast of unleavened bread seven days," chap. xxxv. 17: and in the Book of Ezra: "The children of the captivity kept the passover upon the fourteenth day of the first month, and kept the feast of unleavened bread seven days, with joy;" chap. vi. 19. 22.

It is an inquiry, which hath occasioned no little debate, whether Christ kept his last passover at the same time with the rest of the Jews, or one day sooner. Several considerable critics* are of opinion, that, for special reasons, he

* Vid. Grotii Annot. in Matt. xxvi. 18; Scaliger. de Emend. Tempor. lib. vi. p. 567, et seq. edit. Collon. Allob. 1629; Casaubon. Exercitat. in Baronii Annales, exerc. xvi. sect. xii.—xxi. p. 405—439, edit. Genev. 1655; Cudworth's True Notion of the Lord's Supper, chap. iii.; Saubertus de Ultimo Christi Paschate, cap. i. sect. viii.—xii.; apud Thesaurum Theolog. Philolog. vol. ii. p. 195. 199. It is remarkable, that these eminent critics, who all agree that Christ ate the passover on a different day from the Jews, are divided in their opinions concerning the method of accounting for it. Grotius distinguishes between the paschal sacrifice, and a supper commemorative of the passover, and supposes our Saviour celebrated the latter only, before the time prescribed by the law for the paschal sacrifice, which he foresaw his death would prevent his observing. Scaliger and Causabon apprehend, that Christ ate the paschal sacrifice on the day perscribed by the law, but not when the Jews did, they having deferred it, according to their supposed custom when it fell the day before the sabbath, that there might not be two sabbaths together. Cudworth opposes the notions both of Grotius and Scaliger, and makes the ground of this difference of the days to be, that our Saviour and his apostles, and divers others of the most religious Jews, regulated the time of their observation of the passover by computing from the true phasis of the moon, and not by the decree of the senate. The opinion of Grotius, concerning the ground of this difference of the days, is justly exploded likewise by Leidekker, de Republ. Hebræor. lib. ix. cap. iv. p. 551, 552, though he strenuously maintains, that the days were different.

kept it the day before the stated and usual time. This sentiment they ground on several passages of Scripture; particularly on the account in the thirteenth chapter of St. John, ver. 1—29, of the supper which Christ ate with his disciples, which, if it be, as there is good reason to believe it was, the last supper he ate with them, that is, the passover supper, it is expressly said to be before the feast of the passover, that is, before the usual time of keeping it. Again, the disciples imagined their Lord had ordered Judas "to buy those things they had need of against the feast," ver. 29; which seems to imply, that although for particular reasons he ate the paschal lamb that evening, nevertheless the time of the feast was not yet arrived.

Another passage, alleged in support of this opinion, is in the eighteenth chapter of St. John, where we are informed, that on the day of our Saviour's crucifixion, which was the day after he had ate the passover, the Jews "would not go into the judgment-hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover," ver. 28: which implies, it is said, that they had not yet ate it.

Again, in the nineteenth chapter, the same day, that is, the day of our Lord's crucifixion, is said to be the "preparation of the passover," ver. 14; and therefore, it is alleged, the passover could not yet be eaten.

Dr. Whitby argues on the opposite side of the question in the following manner:*

1st. In the twenty-sixth chapter of St. Matthew it is said, that on "the first day of unleavened bread the disciples prepared the passover," ver. 17; and in the evening Christ ate it with them: and in St. Mark it is observed, that this was the day on which they, that is, the Jews, killed the passover; chap. xiv. 12.

2dly. Christ says to his disciples, "Ye know that after

Deylingius, in conformity with the opinion of several other learned men, supposes, that Christ did not celebrate the passover at all, but only his own supper (Observationes Sacræ, vol. i. observ. lii. sect. xiv.—xix.), but he is confuted by Harenberg, in his Dissert. on John xviii. 28, sect. xxvi. et seq., published in the Thesaurus Novus Theologico-Philolog.

* See his Dissertation on this subject, in an Appendix to the fourteenth chapter of St. Mark.

two days is the feast of the passover;" Matt. xxvi. 2. Now the feast of the passover and of unleavened bread is one and the same, or at the same time, Mark xiv. 1; Luke xxii. 1. Since, therefore, as hath been just shown, Christ did not eat the passover till the first day of unleavened bread, it follows that he did not eat it till after those two days, that is, at the time when the disciples knew it was to be eaten according to the law.

3dly. The day following our Saviour's eating the passover was a feast-day; for Barabbas, it is said, was released at the feast: Matt. xxvii. 15. 26; Mark xv. 6. 15. Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, in which a holy convocation was held, was the day after eating the passover; Lev. xxiii. 4, *et seq.*

4thly. As Christ was "made under the law," which continued in full force till after his resurrection, he could not have kept the passover the day before the law prescribed it, without just censure, nor before the rest of the Jews observed it, according to their interpretation of the law, without their censure, which he does not appear to have incurred; nor can it be imagined his disciples would have come to him with that question, "Where wilt thou that we prepare to eat the passover," before the time which the law appointed, or which was usual, for eating it.

5thly. The paschal lamb could not be slain but "in the place which God had chosen to put his name there," Deut. xvi. 6; that is, in the tabernacle or temple. Now it cannot be supposed that the priests would have killed the paschal lamb for Jesus, or suffered it to have been killed in the temple, before the day which the law prescribed, namely, the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, when they killed it for all the people; or before the day which was observed according to their rules of interpreting the law.

These reasons seem to me to prove unanswerably, that Christ ate the passover at the usual time, when the rest of the Jews did. Let us then inquire, how the passages alleged to the contrary are to be understood.

1st. Bishop Kidder,* and the Doctors Lightfoot† and Whitby,‡ are of opinion, that the supper spoken of in the

* Demonst. of the Messiah, chap. iii. p. 60, 61.

† Horæ Hebr. Matt. xxvi. 6. ‡ Ubi supra.

thirteenth chapter of St. John was not the passover, but another supper at Bethany some nights before; but the contrary is proved by Dr. Doddridge and Dr. Guyse.* As for the phrase, "Before the feast of the passover," ver. 1, it need only be understood to mean before the feast began, or before they sat down to supper; and δειπνου γενομενου, which in our version is, "supper being ended," ver. 2, may be better rendered, "supper being come:" πρωιας γενομενης signifies "when morning was come," John xxi. 4: ἡμερας γενομενης, "when day was come," Acts xii. 18; xvi. 35: σιγης γενομενης, "when silence was made;" chap. xxi. 40.

As to Judas's buying things against the feast, it is easy to be understood of the sacrifices, and whatever they would need to celebrate the ensuing festival, or the feast of unleavened bread.

2dly. The passage in the eighteenth chapter of St. John, relating to the solicitude which the Jews expressed, not to be defiled on the day of our Lord's crucifixion, in order that they might eat the passover, ver. 28; may be understood of the sacrifices which were offered on the feast of unleavened bread, otherwise called the passover.

3dly. As for the παρασκευη του πασχα, or preparation of the passover, spoken of in the nineteenth chapter of St. John, ver. 14, as being the day of our Lord's crucifixion, it signifies the preparation for the paschal sabbath, or the sabbath which fell in the paschal week, and was observed with some peculiar solemnity; for it was esteemed to be, as it is expressly styled, ver. 31, "an high day," or the great day of the feast.†

* See Doddridge and Guyse in ver. 1.

† Among those who maintain that our Saviour kept the passover at the same time with the Jews, see Bochart. Hieroz. lib. ii. cap. i. Oper. tom. ii. p. 560—571, 4th edit. Lugd. Bat. 1712; Basnage in his History of the Jews, lib. v. cap. x. sect. xliv. p. 437; Frischmuthi Dissertat. in Matt. xxvi. 2, apud Thesaur. Theolog. Philolog. tom. ii. p. 189; Harenbergi Dissertat. in Joh. xviii. 28, apud Thesaur. Nov. Theolog. Philolog. tom. ii. p. 538; Reland. Antiq. pars iv. cap. iii. sect. ix. ad ult. p. 467—472, 3d edit. 1717. Bynæus, de Morte Christi, lib. i. cap. i. sect. xix.—xxxii. p. 24—65, edit. Amstel. 1691, hath represented the arguments on both sides. See also Witsii Meletem. dissert. xi.; and Leusden. Philolog. Hebræo-mixt. dissert. xxxviii. de Paschate, quæst. v.

Thirdly. As to the time of the day, when the passover was to be killed and eaten, it was בין הערבים *bein hangnarbaim*, "between the two evenings," Exod. xii. 6; which means the after part of the day, as appears from the use of the same phrase in the twenty-eighth chapter of the book of Numbers, where it stands opposed to the morning: "One lamb shalt thou offer in the morning, and the other lamb shalt thou offer at evening;" ver. 4. But what part or hour of the afternoon is intended by it, is disputed between the Rabbinists and the Karraites.

The Rabbinists understand by the first of the two evenings, the time of the sun's beginning to decline from his meridian altitude, which they fix at half an hour after twelve; by the other, the time of his setting. In the same manner the ancient Grecians distinguish between the two evenings, as we learn from a note of Eustatius on the seventeenth book of the Odyssey; who saith, that, according to the ancients, there are two evenings; one, which they called the latter evening, at the close of the day; the other, the former evening, which commences presently after noon.* These were the two evenings more generally understood by the Jews in the time of Josephus; for, he says, they killed the paschal lamb from the ninth hour to the eleventh, that is, from our three to five o'clock in the afternoon.†

The Karraites understand the first of the two evenings to commence from sun-set; before which, according to them, the passover was not to be killed and eaten; and the latter, from the beginning of dark night; so that, in their opinion, "between the two evenings" means in the twilight. Their notion, at least as to the time of eating the passover, seems to be countenanced by the letter of the law in Deuteronomy: "Thou shalt sacrifice the passover at evening, at the going down of the sun;" chap. xvi. 6. And in the book of Joshua it is said, that "the children of Israel encamped in Gilgal, and kept the passover on the fourteenth day of the month at even;" chap. v. 10. Nevertheless, the duration of the twilight at the equinoctial seasons, at one of which the passover was

* Vid. Bochart. Hierozoic. part i. lib. ii. cap. l. Oper. tom. ii. p. 559, edit. 1712.

† De Bello Judaic. lib. vi. cap. ix. sect. iii. p. 399, edit. Haverc.

kept, being shorter than at any other time of the year, would hardly afford time sufficient, especially in that climate, for killing, roasting, and eating the lamb. It is, therefore, probable, either that by "sacrificing and keeping the passover," in the forecited text in Deuteronomy, is meant merely the eating of it; or that, by "evening and the going down of the sun," is denoted the whole time of its declining from the meridian altitude till sun-set.*

Thus much for the time of this feast.

2dly. Concerning the rites with which it was to be celebrated, we are to observe,

1st. The matter of the paschal feast; which was to be "a lamb without blemish, a male of the first year from the sheep or from the goats;" Exod. xii. 5. The Hebrew word שה *seh*, which we render lamb, signifies the young either of the sheep or of the goats; which we have no English word, as I remember, to answer. The שה *seh* of the passover might be, what we call either a lamb or a kid. But as lambs were preferable, being the better food, Theodoret† hath probably given the just sense of this law: "He that has a lamb, let him offer it; but if not, let him offer a kid."‡ Though our Saviour, therefore, is so often called a lamb, in reference to this ancient type of him, yet he is never called a kid.

The paschal lamb must be a male; which is accounted preferable to a female; Mal. i. 14. Therefore, though the peace-offerings, which were eaten by the people, might be either male or female, Levit. iii. 6; yet the burnt-offerings, which were wholly offered to God, or consumed upon his altar, and which were, therefore, the more perfect sacrifices, must be all males; chap. i. 3. 10.

Perhaps in this circumstance, as in many others, Jehovah designed to oppose the rites of the Jewish worship to the customs of the idolatrous Gentiles, who esteemed sacrifices of the female kind to be the most valuable, and the most accept-

* On this controversy see Martinii Etymologicum; Buxtorfii Lexic. Biblic.; et Bocharti Hierozoic. part i. lib. ii. cap. l. p. 558—560.

† Theodorit. Quæstion. in Exod. quæst. xxiv. Oper. tom. i. p. 90, B, edit. Paris, 1642.

‡ Vid. Mishn. tit. Cherithoth, cap. vi. sect. ix. cum not. Bartenor. tom v. p. 265.

able to their gods: "In omnibus sacris fœminei generis plus valent victimæ," says Servius in his notes on Virgil.* We are informed, indeed, by Herodotus, that it was the custom of the Egyptians to offer only males,† which Bochart supposes they borrowed from the Jews.‡

Again, the paschal lamb must be בְּן-שָׁנָה *ben-shanah*, "the son of a year;" by which some understand a lamb of the last year, which, considering the usual yeaning time, must be upward of a year old at the season of the passover. But as a lamb grown to that degree of maturity was rather too large to be conveniently roasted whole, and eaten up at one family meal, as the paschal lamb was to be; the opinion of the Jewish doctors is, in this instance, more probable, that it was to be a lamb of the present year, or of the last yeaning time,§ which ordinarily preceded the passover by a month or two. This well agrees with the use of the Hebrew phrase, "The son of so many years;" which ordinarily signifies the year current; as appears from the seventh chapter of Genesis, wherein it is said, that "Noah was six hundred years old," בְּן-שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת *ben-shesh meoth*, the son of six hundred years, "when the flood of waters was upon the earth," ver. 6; and presently afterward this is said to be in the "six hundredth year of Noah's life," ver. 11. Thus the priests and Levites were to enter on their ministry "at thirty years old," Numb. iv. 3; but that is properly to be understood of the year current, or when they had entered on the thirtieth year. So Christ entered on his public ministry, *ὡσει ετων τριακοντα αρχομενος*, when he began to be about thirty years of age; Luke iii. 23.

The age then of the paschal lamb is thus determined by the rabbies; it must not be less than eight days, and yet under a year old: not less than eight days, for so is the law concerning firstlings and burnt-offerings, that they were to be seven days with the dam, and from the eighth they might be accepted in sacrifices, Exod. xxii. 30; Lev. xxii. 27: which

* Serv. in Æneid. viii. v. 641. Other proofs may be seen in Bochart, Hieroz. part i. lib. ii. cap. xxxiii. Oper. tom. ii. p. 322.

† Herodot. Euterp. cap. xli. p. 104, edit. Gronov.

‡ Ubi supra, p. 321, et cap. l. p. 584.

§ Vid. Cartwright. Electa Targumico-rabbin. in Exod. xii. 5.

law the Jewish doctors extend, and perhaps not without reason, to the paschal sacrifice; and Maimonides says, "If the lamb was older than the year only an hour, it was not permitted as an oblation.*

Once more, As to the qualities of the paschal lamb, "It must be without blemish." The rabbies reckon up fifty blemishes, which disqualified beasts for sacrifices; as five in the ear, three in the eyelid, eight in the eye, &c.;† but what those blemishes were, which disqualify according to the law of God, sufficiently appears in the twenty-second chapter of Leviticus: the beasts that were blind, or broken, or maimed, or that had a wen, or the scurvy or scab, or any part superfluous or defective, or that was bruised, or crushed, or broken, or cut; these were not to be offered in sacrifice; ver. 20—24.

We must not pass over a conjecture of some persons concerning the reason of God's commanding the Israelites to eat a male lamb, or young ram, with so much solemnity about the vernal equinox; namely, that it was in opposition to the idolatry of the Egyptians, who at this season, of the sun's entering into the sign Aries, paid some solemn worship to the creature by whose name that sign was distinguished. The author of the Chronicon Orientale, as quoted by Patrick,‡ saith, that the day on which the sun entered Aries was most solemn among the Egyptians; and R. Abraham Seba observes, that this feast of the Egyptians being at its height on the fourteenth day, God ordered the killing and eating of a lamb at that time;§ in contempt, it should seem, of their worship of Aries, and as a sensible evidence, that he could be no god whom the Israelites eat.‖ Rabbi Levi Ben Gershom saith, God intended by this to expel from the minds of the

* Maimon. de Ratione Sacrificiorum Faciendorum, cap. i. sect. xii. xiii. apud Crenii Fascicul. Sext. p. 288.

† Maimon. de Ratione adeundi Templi, cap. vii. apud Crenii Fascic. Sext. p. 208, et seq.

‡ Patrick on Exod. xii. 3.

§ Tzeror. Hammor. fol. 70. col. 4. See the passage in Spencer de Legibus Hebræor. lib. ii. cap. iv. sect. i. vol. i. p. 296, edit. Cantab. 1727.

‖ "Cæso ariete," says Ticitus, "velut in contumeliam Hammonis." Histor. lib. v. cap. iv. p. 200, edit. Glasg. 1743. See also Targum Jonathan on Exod. viii. 22, in Walton's Polyglot, tom. iv.

Israelites the bad opinions of the Egyptians. This, however, Dr. Patrick looks upon to be mere conjecture.* The

Second thing we observe in the paschal rites is the taking the lamb from the flock four days before it was killed; Exod. xii. 3. For which the rabbies assign the following reasons: that the providing it might not, through a hurry of business, especially at the time of their departure from Egypt, be neglected till it was too late: that by having it so long with them before it was killed, they might have the better opportunity of observing, whether there were any blemishes in it: and by having it before their eyes so considerable a time, might be more effectually reminded of the mercy of their deliverance out of Egypt: and likewise to prepare themselves for so great a solemnity as the approaching feast. On these accounts, some of the rabbies inform us, it was customary to have the lamb tied these four days to their bed-posts; a rite which they make to be necessary and essential to the passover in all ages.†

Others conceive, with an equal degree of probability, that this was one of those circumstances of the first passover, which were not designed to be continued and practised afterwards; of which sort we shall observe several others. It was highly proper the providing the lamb before their departure out of Egypt should not be left to the very day of their departure, when they must unavoidably be in some hurry and confusion: a reason, however, which would not take place in after-times. Besides, those who came annually out of all parts of the country to keep the passover at Jerusalem, could not well observe it, unless they came at least four days before-hand. It is indeed related in the eleventh chapter of St. John, ver. 55, "that many went out of the country to Jerusalem before the passover;" but the reason assigned is, that it was "to purify themselves." Nothing is said of their providing lambs beforehand. It moreover appears, that on the former part of that very day on which the passover was to be killed and eaten, Christ and his disciples had not so much as provided a place where they should eat it: for "the disciples said unto him,

* Patrick, ubi supra.

† Targum Jonathan et R. Solomon in loc. Vid. Cartwright. Electa Targumico-rabbin. in Exod. xii. 3.

Where wilt thou, that we go and prepare, that thou mayest eat the passover;" Mark xiv. 12. Whereas, if they had provided the lamb four days before, they would in all probability have kept it at the house where they intended to eat it; and there would have been then no room for this question. It is more likely they went and bought one in the market, kept on the preparation of the passover for that purpose, as well as to furnish the other sacrifices that were to be offered on the ensuing festival: which market some had profanely brought into the very court of the temple; John ii. 13, 14. Again, if the lamb, the principal thing, had been provided, it is not so probable the disciples should have supposed, as we know they did, that Christ by his speech to Judas, "What thou doest, do quickly," meant, that he should "buy those things which they had need of against the feast;" chap. xiii. 27. 29.

3dly. Next followed the killing of the paschal lamb; which at the first passover in Egypt, as there was no national altar, was performed in private houses. But after their settlement in Canaan, it was ordered to be done in "the place which the Lord should choose to place his name there;" Deut. xvi. 2. By the name of God in this passage is denoted God himself: to "call upon his name" is to call upon him. And by placing his name there, is meant fixing in that place the special tokens of his presence, as the ark, with the mercy-seat and the cloud of glory over it. This place seems at first to have been Mispah, afterward Shiloh; and when that was destroyed, the ark was removed to several places, till at last it was fixed at Jerusalem.

It is observable, that though there is frequent mention in the law of Moses of some place which God would choose to fix his name there, it is nowhere declared where that place should be. For this Maimonides* assigns several reasons; the best and most probable is, lest every tribe should desire to have that place to their lot, and thus strife and contention should arise among them. But when the place was afterward fixed by a new revelation, there the national altar was to be erected, and thither all their sacrifices were ordinarily to be brought and offered. The law to which we before re-

* Maimon. Moreh Nevoch. part iii. cap. xlv. p. 475, edit. et vers. Buxtorf. Basil. 1629.

ferred, concerning their "sacrificing the passover unto the Lord their God, of the flock and of the herd, in the place which the Lord should choose to place his name there," Deut. xvi. 2, chiefly respects the sacrifices that were to be offered on the seven days of the feast of unleavened bread, which feast, we have observed before, was sometimes called the passover; as appears, in that the sacrifice of the passover is said to be of the flock and of the herd; whereas the passover, properly so called, was of the flock only. This law, nevertheless, included the paschal lamb, and was so understood by the ancient Jews, as is evident from the account of the solemn passover kept in the reign of king Josiah, 2 Chron. xxxv. 5, 6. 10, 11, when "the priests and the Levites stood in the holy place, and they slew the passover, and the priests sprinkled the blood, and the Levites flayed it." They who killed the passover, are distinguished from the priests who sprinkled the blood; for a common Israelite might kill the paschal lamb, according to the law in Exodus, chap. xii. 6, "the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it." Accordingly, in the passover which was kept in Hezekiah's reign, the service of killing the passover fell upon the Levites, only for those of the congregation that were not clean, 2 Chron. xxx. 17; otherwise, every Israelite was to kill his own paschal lamb. Nor was this a circumstance peculiar to the passover; in all other sacrifices, even in burnt-offerings, which were reckoned the most solemn and sacred of all others, every man might kill his own sacrifice. The proper duty of the priests was only to sprinkle the blood, and offer it on the altar after it was slain; Lev. i. 2—5. The argument, therefore, as formerly hinted, which some have alleged against the priesthood of Christ, and the sacrifice of his death, that then, as priest, he must have killed himself, is futile and groundless, because it did not properly belong to the priests to kill the sacrifices. We proceed to the

4th. article of the paschal rites, the sprinkling of the blood; in order to which it must be received in a bason: "He shall take a bunch of hyssop and dip it in the bason," בסף *besaph*; Exod. xii. 22. Both the Septuagint and the Vulgate seem to have mistaken the meaning of this word,

taking it to signify the door, or the threshold of the house, where some suppose the lamb was killed. The Septuagint renders it παρα την θυραν; the Vulgate, *in limine;* whereas ספים *sippim* and ספות *sippoth*, which are plurals of סף *saph*, are mentioned among the vessels of the sanctuary in the First Book of Kings, chap. vii. 50, and in Jeremiah, chap. lii. 19. This blood was to be sprinkled with a bunch of hyssop upon the lintel and the two side-posts of the doors of their houses, as a signal to the destroying angel to pass over those that were thus marked when he went forth to smite the first-born in all the other houses in Egypt; Exod. xii. 13—23. The blood was to be sprinkled only on the lintel and the side-posts, not on the threshold, that it might not be trod on, but that a proper reverence might be preserved for it as sacred and typical. It cannot be supposed, either that this blood had any natural virtue in it to preserve the family upon whose house it was sprinkled from the plague, or that God or his angel needed such a signal to distinguish between Egyptians and Israelites. The use of it could only be as a sensible token of the Divine promise of protection and safety to the Israelites, designed to assist and encourage their faith. With the like view God made the rainbow a token or sign of his covenant and promise to Noah, that he would never again bring a deluge on the earth; Gen. ix. 10—15. No doubt the blood of the paschal lamb, sprinkled on their houses, was intended, likewise, to be a typical sign of protection from the vengeance of God through the blood of Christ, which is therefore called "the blood of sprinkling;" Heb. xii. 24. In both respects it is said that Moses "through faith kept the passover and the sprinkling of blood," chap. xi. 28; through faith in God's promise of a present temporal protection, and through faith in the blood of Christ, as typified by this blood, for spiritual and eternal salvation.

The Egyptians, who were, in many cases, unacquainted with the original of their own rites, had among them, many ages afterward, according to Epiphanius, a very sensible memorial of the preservation of the Israelites, by this red mark being fixed on their houses; for at the vernal equinox, which was the time of the passover, they used to mark their sheep, their trees, and the like, εκ μιλτεως, with red ochre, or some-

what of that kind, which they supposed would preserve them.*

The circumstance of sprinkling blood upon the door-posts was plainly peculiar to the first passover; for we find in after-ages, when the paschal lamb was killed in the court of the tabernacle or temple, the blood of it was sprinkled on the altar like the blood of the other sacrifices; 2 Chron. xxxv. 11.

5thly. The paschal lamb was to be roasted whole. "Eat it not raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire, his head, with his legs, and with the purtenance thereof;" Exod. xii. 9. The prohibition of eating it raw, for which there might seem to be little occasion, since mankind have generally abhorred such food, is understood by some to have been given in opposition to the barbarous customs of the heathens, who in their feasts of Bacchus, which, according to Herodotus† and Plutarch,‡ had their original in Egypt, used to tear the members of living creatures to pieces, and eat them raw. It is therefore observable, that the Syriac version renders the clause, "Eat not of it raw, eat not of it while it is alive."§

Bochart, after R. Solomon and Aben-Ezra, derives the Hebrew word נא *na*, which we render raw, from the Arabic נא *naa*, or נ *ni*, *semicoctus*, half-dressed.‖

The paschal lamb was to be roasted; which, besides its typical meaning, to be hereafter considered, might be ordered as a matter of convenience at the first passover, in order that their boiling vessels might be packed up, ready for their march out of Egypt, while the lamb was roasting.

It must be "roasted whole, with its legs and appurtenances." By the appurtenances we are not to understand the guts, but the heart, lights, liver, and whatever other parts of the inwards are fit for food. This injunction might perhaps be designedly opposed to the superstition of the Gentiles, who

* Epiphan. adversus Hæres. hæres. xviii. Nazaræor. sect. iii. p. 39, edit. Petav.

† Herodot. Euterp. cap. xlix. p. 107, 108, edit. Gronov.

‡ Plutarch. de Iside et Osiride, Oper. tom. ii. p. 355, 356. 362, B, &c. edit. Francfort. 1620.

§ Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. lib. ii. cap. iv. sect. ii. p. 300—3035.

‖ Hierozoic. lib. ii. cap. l. Oper. tom. ii. p. 595.

used to rake into the entrails of their sacrifices, and collect auguries from them; and it might be partly intended for expedition in the celebration of the first passover.

6thly. The first passover was to be eaten standing, in the posture of travellers, who had no time to lose, and with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, and no bone of it was to be broken; Exod. xii. 8. 11. 46. The posture of travellers was enjoined them, both to enliven their faith in the promise of their now speedy deliverance from Egypt; and also, that they might be ready to begin their march presently after supper. They were ordered, therefore, to eat it with their loins girded; for as they were accustomed to wear long and loose garments, such as are generally used by the eastern nations to this day, it was necessary to tie them up with a girdle about their loins, when they either travelled or betook themselves to any laborious employment. Thus, when Elisha sent his servant Gehazi on a message in haste, he bade him "gird up his loins," 2 Kings iv. 29; and when our Saviour set about washing his disciples' feet, "he took a towel and girded himself;" John xiii. 4.

They were to eat the passover "with shoes on their feet;" for in those hot countries they ordinarily wore sandals, which were a sort of clogs, or went barefoot. But in travelling they used shoes, which were indeed a sort of short boots, reaching a little way up the legs.* Hence, when our Saviour sent his twelve disciples to preach in the neighbouring towns, designing to convince them by their own experience of the extraordinary care of Divine Providence over them, that they might not be discouraged by the length and danger of the journeys they would be called to undertake; I say, on this account he ordered them to make no provision for their present journey, particularly not to take shoes on their feet, but to be shod with sandals; Matt. x. 10, compared with Mark vi. 9.

The Ethiopian Christians have indeed found out another

* See Wagenseil, Sotah, p. 664, edit. Altdorf. 1674, or in Mish. Surenhusii, tom. iii. p. 261; Lightfoot's Horæ Hebr. Matt. x. 10; Sagittarius de Nudipedalibus Veterum, cap. i. sect. xix. et seq. apud Syntagma Dissertationum, tom. i. p. 272, et seq. Rotterod. 1699. But Bynæus is of opinion, that shoes and sandals are the same, De Calceis Hebræorum, lib. i. cap. vi. sect. ix. x. p. 90—98, Dordrac 1715.

reason for the Israelites being commanded to eat the first passover with shoes on their feet; namely, because the land of Egypt was polluted; whereas at Mount Sinai God commanded Moses to put off his shoes from his feet, because the place was holy; and for this reason the Ethiopians say it is a custom with them to be barefoot in their churches.*

Again, they were to eat the passover with staves in their hands, such as were always used by travellers in those rocky countries, both to support them in slippery places, and defend them against assaults; see Gen. xxxii. 10. Of this sort was probably Moses's rod, which he had in his hand when God sent him with a message to Pharaoh, Exod. iv. 2, and which was afterward used as an instrument in working so many miracles. So necessary in these countries was a staff, or walking-stick, on a journey, that it was a usual thing for persons, when they undertook long journeys, to take a spare staff with them, for fear one should fail. When Christ, therefore, sent his apostles on that embassy which we mentioned before, he ordered them not to take staves, μητε ῥαβδους, Luke ix. 3; that is, only one staff or walking-stick, without making provision of a spare one, as was common in long journeys; or, as it is in St. Mark, chap. vi. 8, "save a staff only." If therefore we adhere to the common reading in the parallel passage in St. Matthew, where Christ bade them take μητε ῥαβδον, not a staff, chap. x. 10, it must be understood of a spare staff. Nevertheless many copies have ῥαβδους in this place, which is followed in our translation.

Now these circumstances were plainly peculiar to the first passover; for when the children of Israel were settled in the land of Canaan, they no longer eat the paschal lamb in the posture of travellers, but like men at rest and ease, sitting, or rather lying, on couches; the posture in which our Saviour and his disciples ate the passover; John xiii. 23.

The paschal lamb was to be eaten with unleavened bread; in the Hebrew, מצות *matsoth*, which some derive from מצץ *matsets*, or מצה *matsah*, *compressit*, because bread made without yeast or leaven is heavy and close, as if pressed toge-

* Damianus Goensis de Moribus Æthiopum, cited by Sagittarius de Nudipedalibus Veterum, cap. ii. sect. xv. ubi supra, p. 305, 306, Rotterod. 1699.

ther. Bochart rejects this derivation, and derives it from an Arabic word, with the same radicals, which signifies pure and sincere;* and so מצות *matsoth* signifies bread made of pure flour and water, without any mixture. This suits best with the apostle's allusion: "Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth;" 1 Cor. v. 8.

The reason of the injunction to eat the paschal lamb with unleavened bread was, partly, to remind them of the hardships they had sustained in Egypt, unleavened being more heavy and less palatable than leavened bread; and it is, therefore, called the bread of affliction, Deut. xvi. 3; and partly to commemorate the speed of their deliverance or departure from thence, which was such, that they had not sufficient time to leaven their bread; it is expressly said, that their "dough was not leavened, because they were thrust out of Egypt, and could not tarry," Exod. xii. 39; and on this account it was enacted into a standing law: "Thou shalt eat unleavened bread, even the bread of affliction; for thou camest forth out of Egypt in haste;" Deut. xvi. 3. This rite, therefore, was not only observed at the first passover, but in all succeeding ages.

The salad, or sauce, of bitter herbs was doubtless prescribed for the same reason; namely, to be a memorial of that severe bondage in Egypt, which "made their lives bitter to them," Exod. i. 14; and possibly, also, to denote the haste they were in, which laid them under a necessity of taking up with such wild herbs as were readiest at hand. We have not any account what herbs in particular these were, except from the conjectures of the rabbies, which are not worth our attention.†

To this salad, or sauce, the latter Jews, as Godwin observes, add another, of sweet and bitter things, as dates, figs, raisins, vinegar, and other ingredients, pounded and mixed up together to the consistence of mustard, which they call חרסת

* Bochart. Hieroz. lib. ii. cap. l. p. 601.

† Mishn. tit. Pesachim, cap. ii. sect. vi. tom. ii. p. 141, edit. Surenhus. Their opinion is discussed at large by Bochart, Hierozoic. lib. ii. cap. l. Oper. tom. ii. p. 603—609.

charoseth, and make to be a memorial of the clay in which their fathers laboured in the land of Egypt.* Some imagine this was the sauce in which our Saviour dipped the sop that he gave to Judas; John xiii. 26.

It was farther prescribed, that they should eat the flesh of the lamb without breaking any of his bones; Exod. xii. 46. This the later Jews understand, not of the lesser bones, but only of the greater, which had marrow in them.† Thus was this rite also intended to denote their being in haste, not having time to break the bones and suck out the marrow.‡ But it had likewise a typical meaning, of which we shall have occasion to take notice hereafter.

7thly. It was ordered, that nothing of the paschal lamb should remain till the morning; but, if it was not all eaten, it should be consumed by fire; Exod. xii. 10. The same law was extended to all eucharistical sacrifices, Levit. xxii. 30; no part of which was to be left or set by, lest it should be corrupted, or converted to any profane or common use. An injunction which was designed, no doubt, to maintain the honour of sacrifices, and teach the Jews to treat with reverence whatever was consecrated more especially to the service of God.

As to the first paschal sacrifice, it was the more necessary that it should all be eaten or consumed that night, as the Israelites were to march out of Egypt early the next morning. Otherwise they would have been obliged, either to submit to the inconvenience of carrying the remainder of it along with them, or to the disagreeable circumstance of leaving it behind them, to the contempt of the Egyptians. Moreover, this law with respect to sacrifices might be made so comprehensive and general, on the same account that induced Hezekiah to break in pieces the brazen serpent, 2 Kings xviii. 4: that is, to prevent the abuse of such relics to superstitious uses, and to discountenance the custom of the heathen idolaters, who reserved some part of their sacrifices for any purposes they thought proper; as Herodotus§ informs us concerning the

* Maimon. de Solenn. Pasch. cap. vii. sect. xi. p. 889; Crenii Fasc. Sept.

† Vid. Bochart. Hierozoic. lib. ii. cap. l. Oper. tom. ii. p. 609.

‡ Maimon. Moreh Nevoch. part iii. cap. xlvi. p. 483, Basil. 1629.

§ Herodot. Clio, cap. cxxxii. p. 55, edit. Gronov.

ancient Persians, and as seems to be intimated in the sixth chapter of the apocryphal book of Baruch, where the priests are said "to sell and abuse the things that were sacrificed to idols; and in like manner their wives laid up part thereof in salt;" ver. 28. From whence we may naturally derive the like superstitious custom of some women among Christians, who procure and lay up some part of the bread which has been used in the Lord's supper, to cure their children of the whooping cough.

8thly. It was enjoined the Israelites at the first passover, that they should keep in their own houses all that night, "and none of them should go out of the door of his house till the morning," lest they should be exposed to the destroying angel; Exod. xii. 22, 23. We are not to suppose the angel could not have distinguished an Israelite from an Egyptian, if he had met him in the street; but they were hereby intended to be instructed, that their safety lay in being under the protection of the blood of the lamb, which was sprinkled upon the door-posts of their houses, as an emblem and type of spiritual salvation by the blood of Christ. This rite, however, was peculiar to the first passover, and not observed in succeeding ages; otherwise, Christ and his apostles would not have gone to the mount of Olives the same evening on which they had been eating the passover; Matt. xxvi. 30.

Having thus considered the rites of the passover, we are,

3dly. To inquire into the signification of them.

That the passover had a typical reference to Christ, we learn from the apostle's calling him "our passover;" 1 Cor. v. 7. Godwin has drawn out a catalogue of thirteen articles, in which this type resembles its antitype, and a larger and more particular one may be found in the chapter *de Paschate* of Witsius's *Œconomia Fœderis*, under four general heads: the first respecting the person of Christ; the second, his sufferings; the third, the fruits and effects of them; and the way in which we are to obtain an interest in these fruits and effects. We shall briefly select a few of the particulars under each of these heads.

1st. The person of Christ was typified by the paschal lamb. On which account, as well as in respect to the lamb of the daily sacrifice, he is often represented under the emblem of a

lamb: "Behold the Lamb of God," saith John the Baptist; John i. 29. 36. The fitness and propriety of this type or emblem consists, partly in some natural properties belonging to a lamb, and partly in some circumstances peculiar to the paschal lamb. A lamb being, perhaps, the least subject to choler of any animal in the brute creation, was a very proper emblem of our Saviour's humility and meekness, and of his inoffensive behaviour, Matt. xi. 29; for he, by whose precious blood we were redeemed, was "a Lamb without blemish and without spot," 1 Pet. i. 19; and likewise of his exemplary patience and submission to his Father's will under all his sufferings, and in the agony of death; for though he was "oppressed and afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth;" Isa. liii. 7. By his almighty power he could have delivered himself out of the hands of his enemies, as he had done on former occasions, Luke iv. 29, 30; John viii. 59; but behold the lion of the tribe of Judah now transformed into a lamb, by his obedience to his Father's will, and compassion to the souls of men.

There were, also, some circumstances peculiar to the paschal lamb, which contributed to its fitness and propriety as a type and emblem of Christ: such as its being ordered to be free from all blemish and natural defect, that it might the better represent the immaculate Son of God, who was made without sin, and never did any iniquity, Heb. vii. 26; that it was to be taken out of the flock, therein representing that divine person, who, in order to his being made a sacrifice for our sins, did first become one of us, by taking our flesh and blood, and "was made in all things like to his brethren;" chap. ii. 14. 17.

The paschal lamb was to be a male of the first year, when the flesh was in the highest state of perfection for food; more fitly to represent the "child that was to be born," "the son that was to be given" (Isa. ix. 6) to us, and the excellency of the sacrifice he was to offer for us, after he had lived a short life among men. Once more:

The paschal lamb was to be taken out of the flock four days before it was sacrificed. This circumstance, if we understand it of such prophetic days as are mentioned in the fourth chapter of Ezekiel, is perfectly applicable to Christ, who left his

mother's house and family, and engaged publicly in his office as a Saviour, four years before his death.

2dly. The sufferings and death of Christ were also typified by the paschal lamb in various particulars. For instance, that lamb was to be killed "by the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel," Exod. xii. 6; and so the whole estate of the Jews, the priests, scribes, elders, rulers, and the populace in general, conspired in the death of Christ (compare Mark xiv. 43, with Luke xxiii. 13). The paschal lamb was to be killed by the effusion of its blood, as pointing out the manner of Christ's death, in which there was an effusion of blood on the cross. It was to be roasted with fire, as representing its antitype enduring on our account the fierceness of God's anger, which is said to "burn like fire:" Psalm lxxxix. 46; Jer. iv. 4. Hence that complaint of our suffering Saviour in the prophecy concerning him in the twenty-second Psalm: "My heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my bowels; my strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws;" ver. 14, 15.

There was, farther, a remarkable correspondence between the type and the antitype, with respect to the place and time in which each was killed as a sacrifice. The place was the same as to both; namely, "the place which the Lord should choose to put his name there," which, from the reign of David, was at Jerusalem: and the time was also the same; for Christ suffered his agonies on the same evening on which the passover was celebrated; and his death the next day, between the two evenings, according to the most probable interpretation of that phrase, namely, between noon and sun-set.

3dly. Several of the happy fruits and consequences of the death of Christ were remarkably typified by the sacrifice of the paschal lamb; such as protection and salvation by his blood, of which the sprinkling of the door-posts with the blood of the lamb, and the safety which the Israelites by that means enjoyed from the plague that spread through all the families of the Egyptians, was a designed and illustrious emblem. It is in allusion to this type, that the blood of Christ is called "the blood of sprinkling:" 1 Pet. i. 2; Heb. xii. 24.

Immediately upon the Israelites eating the first passover, they were delivered from their Egyptian slavery, and restored to full liberty, of which they had been deprived for many years; and such is the fruit of the death of Christ, in a spiritual and much nobler sense, to all that believe in him; for he hath thereby "obtained eternal redemption for us," and "brought us into the glorious liberty of the children of God:" Heb. ix. 12; Rom. viii. 21.

4thly. The ways and means by which we are to obtain an interest in the blessed fruits of the sacrifice of Christ, were also represented by lively emblems in the passover; namely, by the sprinkling of the blood of the lamb on the door-posts, and by eating the flesh of it. The door-posts may be understood to signify the heart of man, which is the gate, or door, by which the King of glory is to enter, Psalm xxiv. 7; and which is as manifest in the sight of God as the very doors of our houses are to any one that passes by them; 1 Sam. xvi. 7. The sprinkling of the blood on the door-posts may therefore signify the purifying of the heart by the grace of Christ, which he purchased for us by his blood. This seems to be the apostle's allusion in the following expression: "Having your hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience;" Heb. x. 22.

By eating the flesh of the lamb we have no difficulty to understand faith in Jesus Christ, since Christ himself has expressed saving faith in him by the metaphor of eating his flesh, propably in reference to the passover; John vi. 53.

It is worthy of our notice, that the lamb was to be roasted whole, and was to be all eaten, and none of it left; which may fitly signify, that, in order to our obtaining the benefits of Christ's sacrifice, we must receive him, submit to him, and trust upon him in all his characters and offices, as our prophet, our priest, and our king; nor are we to expect, that he will redeem and save us from the wrath to come, if we will not at present have him to reign over us.

The passover was to be eaten with bitter herbs; which, besides its being an intended memorial of the afflictions of the Israelites in Egypt, may fitly signify, that repentance for sin must accompany faith in Christ; and also, that, if we are partakers of the benefits of Christ's sufferings, we must expect, and be content, to be in some measure partakers likewise of

his sufferings. To this purpose the apostle speaks of "the fellowship of his sufferings," Phil. iii. 10; and elsewhere saith, "that if we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him;" 2 Tim. ii. 12.

The passover was also to be eaten with unleavened bread, which St. Paul interprets to signify sincerity and purity of heart, in opposition to malice, wickedness, and falsehood; and which must necessarily accompany faith in Christ in order to his being our passover, that is, our protector from the wrath of God, and our redeemer from spiritual bondage and misery; 1 Cor. v. 7, 8.

It was farther ordered, that in eating the paschal lamb they should "not break a bone of it;" a circumstance in which there was a remarkable correspondence between the type and the antitype; John xix. 33. 36.

Perhaps there is more fancy than judgment in that mystical interpretation which some have put on this circumstance, who by the bones understand those secrets of God, or those hard and difficult things in the divine counsels, which we are not able to comprehend, and which we should, therefore, be humbly content to be ignorant of, without too curiously and anxiously searching into them, according to the advice of Moses: "Secret things belong to the Lord our God; but those which are revealed, to us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law;" Deut. xxix. 29.

None, who were legally unclean and polluted, might eat the passover, which may farther hint to us, that purity and holiness are necessary and incumbent on all that would partake of the benefit of Christ's sacrifice; for "what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? what communion hath light with darkness? what concord hath Christ with Belial?" 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15.

The Israelites were to eat their first passover in the habit and posture of travellers, which, in the mystical sense, may signify, that such as enter into covenant with God, through Christ, must be resolved upon, and ready to go forth to, every duty to which he calls them. They are not to look on this world as their home; but, remembering that they are travelling toward heaven, they are to bear that blessed world much upon their thoughts, and to be diligent in preparing for

their entrance into it. To this purpose are we exhorted "to gird up the loins of our minds and to be sober;" to "stand, having our loins girded about with truth;" and, "as pilgrims and strangers, to abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul:" 1 Pet. i. 13; Eph. vi. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 11. In all these expressions there seems to be some reference to the habit and posture of the Israelites at the first passover.

They were to eat the passover in haste; and thus we must "flee for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us," Heb. vi. 18; must not delay and trifle, but "give diligence to make our calling and election sure," 2 Pet. i. 10; for the kingdom of heaven is said to "suffer violence, and the violent take it by force;" Matt. xi. 12.

In the last place, the Israelites were to eat the passover, each family in their own house; and none might go out of the house any more that night, lest the destroying angel should meet and kill him. By the houses may be understood the church of Christ, in which only we are to expect communion with him and salvation by him; and having entered into it, we must not go out again, lest we meet with the doom of apostates (see Heb. vi. 4—6; x. 39; 2 Pet. ii. 20, 21), which is dreadful beyond description.*

Of the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

Having treated pretty largely of the passover, we proceed to the feast of unleavened bread, which immediately followed it, and was kept seven days, from the fifteenth of the month Nisan to the twenty-first, inclusive; as appears from the two following passages; the first from the book of Exodus: "In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month, at even, ye shall eat unleavened bread, until the one-and-twentieth day of the month at even;" chap. xii. 18. Again, from

* Besides Witsius, see Mather on the Types, p. 521—530, Dublin, 1685.

On the subject of the passover in general, with the rest of the authors already quoted, see Lightfoot, in his Temple Service, chap. xii.—xiv.; and Spencer, De Legibus Hebræor. lib. ii. cap. iv. tom. i. p. 293—310. In Witsii Œconom. Fœderis, is a good abridgment of what Bochart hath said on the subject.

the book of Numbers: "In the fourteenth day of the first month is the passover of the Lord; and in the fifteenth day of this month is the feast; seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten; in the first day shall be an holy convocation;" chap. xxviii. 16, 17. When, therefore, it is said in the sixteenth chapter of Deuteronomy, "Six days shalt thou eat unleavened bread, and on the seventh shall be a solemn assembly," ver. 8, it cannot be meant that they were to use unleavened bread six days only; but that having eaten it six days, they should conclude the festival on the seventh with a solemn assembly, continuing to eat unleavened bread on this day, as they had done on the six preceding. The Samaritan text and the Septuagint read likewise in the thirteenth chapter of Exodus, "Six days shalt thou eat unleavened bread," ver. 6, and not seven, as it is in the Hebrew copy and the Targum.

The very day of the passover, viz. the fourteenth of Nisan, is called the first day of unleavened bread, both by St. Matthew and St. Mark: Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12: whereas, according to the passage before cited from the book of Numbers, the fifteenth day of the month being said to be the first day of the feast, that is, of unleavened bread, the day of the passover was the day before the first day of unleavened bread. Some, therefore, suppose, that πρωτν is put by the evangelists for προτερα, as it is in the first chapter of St. John, where John the Baptist says, "He that comes after me," πρωτος μου ην, that is, προτερος, "was before me;" ver. 30. Thus πρωτν ήμερα των αζυμων should be rendered, not "the first day of the feast," but "the day before the feast of unleavened bread."* I apprehend, however, there is no need, in order to solve the difficulty, to have recourse to this more unusual meaning of the word πρωτος; for these two feasts, the passover and that of unleavened bread, though distinct in themselves, yet followed close upon one another, and being united into one continued festival for eight days together, hence the name of either of them came to be used for both. The feast of unleavened bread is called the passover by St. Luke, chap. xxii. 1; and why then may not the feast of the passover be called the feast of unleavened bread by St. Matthew and St. Mark, especially since the passover also was eat with unleavened

* Reland. Antiq. part iv. sect. iii. p. 456, 3d edit. 1717.

bread; and this, notwithstanding the feast of unleavened bread, properly so called, did not begin till the next day, at least not till the evening of the paschal day? For it must be remembered, the Jews celebrated their sabbath, and all sacred festivals, from evening to evening. This, indeed, gives us the hint of another solution, which is espoused by some, namely, that the paschal day is called the first day of unleavened bread, because the feast of unleavened bread began on the evening of that day.* But the former solution is, I think, the more satisfactory.

During the whole continuance of this festival they might not eat any leavened bread, nor so much as have it in their houses; Exod. xii. 15. 18, 19. Care, therefore, must be taken, before the feast began, to "purge out the old leaven," as the apostle, in allusion to this rite, expresses it; 1 Cor. v. 7. Concerning this matter the modern Jews are superstitiously exact and scrupulous. The master of the family makes a diligent search into every hole and crevice throughout the house, lest any crumb of leavened bread should remain in it, and that not by the light of the sun or moon, but of a candle. And in order that this exactness may not appear altogether superfluous and ridiculous, care is taken to conceal some scraps of leavened bread in some corner or other, the discovery of which occasions mighty joy. This search, nevertheless, strict as it is, does not give him entire satisfaction. After all, he beseeches God, that all the leavened bread which is in the house, as well what he has found, as what he has not, may become like the dust of the earth, and be reduced to nothing. And as they are thus superstitiously careful in purging out the old leaven, so they are no less exact and scrupulous about making their bread for the feast, lest there should be any fermentation in it, or any thing like leaven mixed with it. For instance: the corn of which it is made must not be carried to the mill on the horse's bare back, lest the heat of the horse should make it ferment; the sack in which it is put must be carefully examined, lest there should be any remainder of old meal in it, which might prove like leaven to the new meal; the dough must be made in a place not exposed to the sun, lest the heat of the sun should make it ferment; and it must

* Reland. ubi supra, p. 455, 456.

be put into the oven immediately after it is made, lest it should ferment itself.*

From the Jews, probably, the Roman Catholics have borrowed many superstitious niceties about the corn and dough, of which they make their hosts.

The punishment to be inflicted on any who neglected to cleanse their houses from leaven against the feast, is, in the judgment of the rabbies, scourging.† But the penalty for eating leavened bread during the festival, is, according to the law of God, to be "cut off from the congregation of Israel," Exod. xii. 19; the same punishment which is threatened to the neglect of circumcision, Gen. xvii. 14; and to several other trespasses, both against the moral and ceremonial laws; as to wilful sinning in contempt of the divine authority, Numb. xv. 30, 31; to profaning the sabbath, Exod. xxxi. 14; to the eating of fat and blood, Lev. vii. 25. 27; and to several other violations of the law. But what this כרת *chereth*, as the rabbies call it, from כרת *charath, secuit*, or cutting off, signified, is rather differently conjectured by various writers, than certainly determined by any. Some make it to signify excommunication; others death, to be inflicted by the magistrate; others death by the immediate hand of God. Others say it was making a man childless, so that his family and his name perished in Israel. Maimonides would have it be the extinction both of the soul and body, or perishing like the brutes; and Abarbanel, the loss of future happiness.‡ But hardly any one of these senses will suit all the cases in which this punishment is threatened. It could not mean excommunication from the church of Israel when it is threatened to the neglect of circumcision, because no person was a member of that church till he was circumcised. Nor could it mean death to be immediately inflicted by the hand of God, since the Israelites neglected circumcision with impunity during their journey in the wilderness, for forty

* See Buxtorf. Synag. Judaic. cap. xvii. p. 394—398, 3d edit. Basil. 1661; and Maimon. de Solennitate Paschatis, cap. ii.—v. p. 843—877, Crenii Fascicul. Septimi.

† Maimon. de Solennitate Paschatis, cap. i. p. 838—843, Crenii Fascicul. Septimi.

‡ Abarbanel. Dissert. de Pœnâ Excidii, ad calcem Buxtorf. Dissert. de Sponsalibus et Divortiis, where these several opinions are examined.

years together; Josh. v. 5. Nor could it signify the same punishment, when threatened to the neglect of the passover, since that ordinance was shamefully neglected during several wicked reigns of the Jewish kings, till Hezekiah, and after him Josiah, revived it; 2 Chron. xxx. xxxv. It is most probable, that כרת *chereth* is a general name for several sorts of punishment, which were to be determined by the nature of the offence. Sometimes it seems to import punishment by the judge, and sometimes by the more immediate hand of God.*

The first and last days of the feast of unleavened bread were to be kept as sabbaths, holy, and free from all servile work, except dressing of victuals, which was unlawful on the weekly sabbath (compare Exod. xii. 16, with chap. xxxv. 3); and they were likewise to be solemnized by a holy convocation. But we find no precept concerning the keeping the five intermediate days, besides their abstaining from leavened bread, and offering certain sacrifices on each of them; Numb. xxviii. 17—25. However, the rabbies have abundantly supplied these defects by their comments; they allow the time to be spent in mirth, and all lawful recreation; and some of them allow works of necessity to be performed, while others think it unlawful even to take up a straw, or to pick their teeth.†

One remarkable offering that was to be made at this feast was the sheaf of the first fruits of the harvest; Lev. xxiii. 10, 11. For though this feast was kept soon after the vernal equinox, yet, in that warm climate, the barley, which was usually sown in November, became ripe at this season. But if it happened that the harvest was not forward enough to be fit to cut at the middle of Nisan, they intercalated a month, which they called Veadar, and the next Nisan, and so put off the festival a month longer.‡

The day on which this offering was made, is said to be "the morrow after the sabbath;" Lev. xxiii. 11. By which, though some have understood the weekly sabbath that fell in the time of this festival, yet the Jews more generally understand by it the first day of the feast, according to which sense

* Mr. Selden hath treated largely on the chereth, De Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. vii. cap. ix. and De Syned. lib. i. cap. vi.

† See these and various other particulars in Buxtorf's Synag. Judaic. cap. xix. p. 430—433, 3d edit.

‡ See Lightfoot, Horæ Hebr. Matt. xii. 1.

the Septuagint renders it τη επαυριον της πρωτης, "the morrow after the first." The Targum of Onkelos renders it, "after the feast day;" and Josephus says expressly, "τη δευτερα των αζυμων ήμερα," &c., on the second day of unleavened bread, which is the sixteenth of Nisan, they take of the fruits of the harvest which they have not touched before; and esteeming it their duty, first to pay due honour to God, from whom they have received their liberal supply, they offer him the first fruits of the barley.*

The rabbies inform us, that this sheaf was gathered and prepared for the offering with a great deal of ceremony, which, as we have no account of it in Scripture, we pass over in silence.†

The moral signification of this title, the offering of the first-fruits, was undoubtedly to be an acknowledgment of his goodness "who gives rain, both the former and the latter rain, in its season, and reserves to men the appointed weeks of harvest," Jer. v. 24; and also of his right to, and propriety in, those bounties of his providence, in consequence of which he may bestow, or take them away, as he pleases, Hos. ii. 8, 9; and likewise, to teach them to look up to God for his blessing to render their earthly enjoyments and possessions profitable and delightful; 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5.

There might also be a typical signification of this rite, as referring to the resurrection of Christ, whose sacrifice and death had been just before represented by that of the paschal lamb, and which is compared by our Lord himself to corn falling into the ground and dying, after which it springs up and brings forth fruit; John xii. 24. Accordingly, the apostle saith, 1 Cor. xv. 20, as it should seem in reference to this type, "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and is become the first-fruits of them that slept."‡

* Joseph. Antiq. lib. iii. cap. x. sect. v. p. 177, 178, edit. Haverc.; see also Lightfoot. Horæ Hebraic. Act. vii. 1.

† See Ainsworth on Levit. xxiii. 10; Lightfoot's Temple Service, chap. xiv. sect. ii.; Outram de Sacrificiis, lib. i. cap. viii. sect. vi. p. 87, London, 1677; Mishn. tit. Sotah, cap. vii. sect. iii. not.; Wagenseil. tom. iii. p. 259, 260, edit. Surenhus.; et tit. Menachoth, cap. x. cum not. Bartenor.; et Maimon. tom. v.

‡ On the sheaf of the first-fruits, see also Reland. Antiq. part iv. cap. iii. sect. viii. p 464—466; Hottingeri Annot. in Godwin. lib. iii. cap. v. sect. iii. not. iii. Francof. 1716. On the feast of unleavened bread, see the authors before referred to on the passover.

CHAPTER V.

OF THE FEAST OF PENTECOST.

The pentecost was the second of the three grand festivals in the ecclesiastical year, at which all the males were to appear before the Lord at the national altar.

It is called by several names in the Old Testament; as the feast of weeks, the feast of harvest, and the day of the first-fruits. In the New Testament it is styled pentecost; and the rabbies have other names for it, calling it "the day of giving the law," and עצרת *gnatsereth*, the word which we render "a solemn assembly."

1st. It is called "the feast of weeks," Exod. xxxiv. 22, because it was celebrated seven weeks, or a week of weeks, after the passover; or rather, after the first day of the feast of unleavened bread; for the computation of the seven weeks began with the second day of that feast, and the next day after the seven weeks were completed was the feast of pentecost. Thus it is said in Leviticus, "Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering, seven sabbaths shall be complete, even to the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days;" chap. xxiii. 15, 16. By the seven sabbaths here mentioned, we are to understand seven weeks; and so it is rendered in the Targum and in the Septuagint; in which sense we find the word σαββατον used in the New Testament: the Pharisee in the parable saith, νηστευω δις του σαββατου, "I fast twice a-week;" that is, on the second and fifth days, on which fasting was recommended by the tradition of the elders; and which were accordingly kept every week as fasts by the devout Jews. And in the first verse of the twenty-

eighth chapter of Matthew, μιαν σαββατων evidently signifies the "first day of the week."

The rabbies lay great stress upon the precept to count the seven sabbaths, or weeks. And Maimonides remarks, that it was to the honour of this festival that they were obliged to count the days of its approach from the preceding passover, as a man, expecting his best and most faithful friend at an appointed time, is accustomed to number the days and hours till his arrival.* Accordingly, the modern Jews make an act of devotion of counting the days from the passover to the pentecost, beginning the computation with a solemn prayer or benediction, in this form: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, the Lord of the world, who hast sanctified us with thy precepts, and commanded us to number the days of the harvest; and this is the first day." Thus they go on with their prayer, or benediction, till the seventh day; then they add, "Now there is one week;" and so they proceed with the same act of devotion every day to the evening of the pentecost.†

This counting is, in some places, performed publicly in the synagogue. But whether it be thus performed or not, every master of a family is obliged to do it every evening at home.‡

Now since there were seven weeks complete between the first day of the feast of unleavened bread and the day of pentecost, it is made matter of inquiry, on what day of the week that remarkable pentecost fell, when the Holy Ghost was shed forth on the apostles; which is said to have been εν τω συμπληρουσθαι την ήμεραν της πεντηκοστης, the meaning of which is ambiguous, as it may either signify, when the day of pentecost was fulfilled and over; or, as it is rendered in our English version, "when it was fully come;" Acts ii. 1. The former sense is most agreeable to the common meaning of the word πληροω, and the text is accordingly rendered in the Italian version, "when the day of pentecost was fully gone." This sense Dr. Lightfoot prefers, and not without reason:§ for

* Maimon. Moreh Nevoch. part iii. cap. xliii. p. 471.

† Hottinger. in Godwin. lib. iii. cap. v. sect. v. p. 575, 576.

‡ See Buxtorf. Synag. Judaic. cap. xx. p. 441, 3d edit.

§ Horæ Hebr. in loc.

since Christ ate his last passover on the same day with the rest of the Jews, as we have already proved, namely, on the fourteenth of Nisan, which was Thursday; the next day, on which he was crucified, must be the first day of the feast of unleavened bread; therefore, the sixteenth day, the Saturday, was the first day of the seven weeks between that and the pentecost; consequently the fiftieth day, or the morrow after the seventh sabbath or week, which was the day of pentecost, must fall on the Saturday, or the Jewish sabbath.

The Doctor apprehends no reason can be assigned for "the disciples being all with one accord in one place," on the day when the Holy Ghost descended upon them, more reasonable and probable, than that they were assembled for the celebration of the Lord's day; which must be, therefore, the next day after the pentecost. Upon which he farther observes, that our Lord, in fulfilling several types by which he was represented, did not confine himself to the day of the type, but deferred the accomplishment to the day following. It was not upon the very day of the passover, but on the ensuing day, that "Christ our passover was sacrificed for us;" 1 Cor. v. 7. It was not on the day that the sheaf of the first-fruits was offered, but the next day, that Christ became the "first-fruits of them that slept;" 1 Cor. xv. 20. In like manner he supposes the descent of the Holy Ghost was not on the day of pentecost, but when it was gone, or the next day after. Nevertheless, our English version, "when the day of pentecost was fully come," is supported by the use of the word πληροω in several places of the Septuagint, as Dr. Hammond hath fully shown.* Thus in the evangelist Luke, ὁτε επλησθησαν ἡμεραι οκτω, which we render, "when eight days were accomplished for circumcising the child," Luke ii. 21, must signify, not when the eighth day was over, but when it was come, for on that day, according to the law, circumcision was to be performed; Levit. xii. 2, 3. Supposing, then, it was the very day of pentecost when the disciples were thus assembled, and the Holy Ghost came upon them, it might nevertheless be the first day of the week, or the Lord's day; for as the Jews reckoned all their sacred and festival days

* See Hammond in loc.

from the evening, so we have the testimony both of Rabbi Solomon and Maimonides,* that they began the computation of the seven weeks from the evening of the sixteenth of Nisan.† Insomuch, that the Saturday, on which our Saviour lay in the sepulchre, was not one of the forty-nine days which made seven weeks complete; but that evening and the first day of the week, on which Christ rose from the dead, made the first day of the first week; and, consequently, Friday evening and Saturday were the forty-ninth, and the Lord's day was the fiftieth, or the day of pentecost. Thus it appears, that according to the manner in which the Scribes computed the seven weeks, the day of pentecost that year, when the Holy Ghost descended upon the apostles, was the first day of the week.

According to the computation of the Baithusians and Karraites, the day of pentecost always fell on the first day of the week; for by "the sabbath on the morrow after which the sheaf was offered," and the computation of the seven weeks began, they understand the weekly sabbath (or the sabbath of the creation, as the Scribes call it), which fell in the paschal week. So that, according to them, the first day of the week was always the first day of the forty-nine days or seven weeks; and, consequently, the fiftieth day, or pentecost, was always the first day of the week.‡

2dly. It was called "the feast of harvest," Exod. xxiii. 16, on the following account, according to the learned Mr. Joseph Mede, because, as the harvest began at the passover, so it ended at pentecost.§ Bochart is of the same opinion, who saith, that as about the time of the passover the sickle was

* R. Solom. cited by Meyer in not. ad Megillath Taanith, cap. i. p. 7, ad calcem Tractat. de Tempor. et Festis Hebræorum; Maimon. de Sacrificiis Jugibus, cap. vii. sect. xxii. p. 477, Crenii Fascic. Sexti.

† See also Megillath Taanith, ubi supra, p. 4—6.

‡ R. Obad. de Bartenora in Mishn. tit. Chagigah, cap. ii. sect. iv. p. 419; Megillath Taanith, ubi supra. See the dispute concerning this computation in Meyer, de Tempor. et Festis Hebræor. part ii. cap. xiii. sect. xxi.—xxiv. p. 295—297; Reland. Antiq. part iv. cap. iv. sect. iii. iv. p. 474—476, 3d edit.; Liber Cozri, part iii. sect. xli. p. 217, cum not.; Buxtorf. in loc. p. 218, 219; Lightfoot, Horæ Hebr. Act. ii. 1; Selden, de Anno Civili Judæorum, cap. vii.

§ Mede's Diatrib. disc. xlviii. p. 269 of his Works.

brought out for cutting the corn, so about pentecost it was laid up again, the harvest being entirely finished.* And it is likewise the sentiment of Godwin. But it doth not seem to be justly founded; for at this feast the first-fruits of their wheat harvest were brought and offered to God; on which account it was called "the feast of harvest," as that name is explained: "the feast of harvest, the first-fruits of thy labour, which thou hast sown in thy field." Now as the first-fruits of the barley harvest were offered at the very beginning of it, as we have shown in the last chapter, so it is reasonable to suppose, the first-fruits of the wheat harvest were likewise offered at the beginning of it, and not delayed till it was over, and all brought into the barns. Hence,

3dly. Another name of this feast is, "the day of the first-fruits," as it is called in the twenty-eighth chapter of the book of Numbers, ver. 26, because on that day they were to "offer a new wheat-offering unto the Lord of two loaves of fine flour baked with leaven," as we are informed in Leviticus, chap. xxiii. 16, 17; and these were to be accompanied with animal sacrifices, namely, "seven lambs, without blemish, of the first year, and a bullock and two rams for a burnt-offering, a kid of the goats for a sin-offering, and two lambs of the first year for a sacrifice of peace-offerings;" ver. 18, 19.

It may to us seem very strange, that the wheat harvest should not begin in Judea till seven weeks after the barley harvest; whereas we are accustomed to see them both together. It was otherwise in the eastern countries;† in Egypt particularly, the barley, it is said, was smitten with the hail, for it was in the ear, whereas the wheat and the rye were not smitten, for they were not grown up; Exod. ix. 31, 32.

It is inquired, why leaven was used in the bread offered at pentecost; whereas it was expressly forbidden at the passover?

The rabbies say, because their bread at the passover was

* Bochart. Hieroz. part i. lib. iii. cap. xiii. Oper. tom. ii. p. 857, edit. 1712. See also Fuller. Miscell. lib. iii. cap. xi.; apud Criticos Sacros, tom. ix. p. 2362, edit. Lond.

† Vid. Bochart, ubi supra, p. 857, 858.

in commemoration of their sudden departure out of Egypt, when they could not stay to have it leavened; but the loaves offered at pentecost were in behalf of the bread which they were ordinarily to eat.*

4thly. This feast is styled in the New Testament πεντηκοστη, that is, the fiftieth; because it was kept fifty days after the passover. Pasor in his Lexicon supposes the word ἡμερα to be understood, with which the feminine adjective πεντηκοστη agrees. This, however, would make a sad tautology of the expression in the Acts, την ἡμεραν της πεντηκοστης, chap. ii. 1.

5thly. The rabbies call this feast "the day of the giving of the law;" for it is the constant opinion of the Jews, that on this day the law was given on Mount Sinai, namely, on the fiftieth day from their departure out of Egypt.† This is collected from the nineteenth chapter of Exodus, in the first verse of which it is said, that in the third month (or in the third new moon, as the Hebrew word קדש *chodhesh* signifies), when the children of Israel were gone forth out of Egypt, the same day (that is, the day of the new moon) they came to Sinai. Adding, therefore, to this day twenty-nine for the last month, and fifteen days of the first month, it makes forty-five from the time of their departure from Egypt to their arrival at Sinai. To which if we add the day when Moses went up to God in the mount, Exod. xix. 3, and the next day when he reported his message from God to the people, and returned their answer, ver. 7, 8; and the three days more which God gave them to prepare themselves for his coming down among them, ver. 11; there were just fifty days from the first passover to the giving the law at Mount Sinai; to which, therefore, according to Maimonides, the institution of this feast had a special regard.

* Abarbanel in Lev. iii., cited by Lightfoot in his Temple Service, chap. xiv. sect. iv.

† Maimon. Moreh Nevoch. part iii. cap. xliii. p. 471, who makes the design of pentecost to be a memorial of the giving of the law. Abarbanel, who differs with him as to the design of the institution, admits, nevertheless, that it was celebrated in the same day on which the law was given. See Meyer, De Tempor. et Festis Hebræor. part ii. cap. xiii. sect. xvi. xvii. p. 293, 294.

6thly. The rabbies again call this feast עצרת *gnatsereth*;* the word which we render "solemn assembly," Lev. xxiii. 36; Deut. xvi. 8; which, though it is never applied to the pentecost in Scripture, yet they in a manner appropriate it to this feast, calling it עצרת *gnatsereth*, κατ' εξοχην. The reason of which might be, as Dr. Lightfoot conjectures, because this feast consisted of one solemn day only, whereas the feast of the passover and of tabernacles had more.†

The more immediate design of this institution seems to have been, that they might thankfully acknowledge the goodness of God in giving them the fruits of the earth, and beg his blessing on the bounties of his providence, by their offering the first-fruits of their harvest to him; and it doubtless had a typical reference to the first-fruits of the Holy Spirit, and of converts to Christ, after the erection of the gospel kingdom, by means of Peter's preaching on the day of pentecost.‡

* See the Chaldee Paraphrase on Numb. xxviii. 26; Mishn. tit. Gnerachin, cap. ii. sect. iii. tom. v. p. 196. See also Reland. Antiq. part iv. cap. iv. sect. iii. p. 472—474; and Lightfoot's Temple Service, chap. xiv. sect. iv.

† Horæ Hebr. Act. ii. 1.

‡ See on the pentecost, Meyer, De Temporibus et Festis Hebræorum, part ii. cap. xiii.; Reland. Antiq. part iv. cap. iv.; Lightfoot, Horæ Hebr. Act. ii. 1, and Temple Service, chap. xiv.; Leydekker de Republ. Hebræor. lib. ix. cap. v.

CHAPTER VI.

OF THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

The feast of tabernacles was the third grand festival, at which all the male Israelites were to attend at the national altar, Deut. xvi. 16. It derived its name from their dwelling in tabernacles,* or booths, during its celebration; Lev. xxiii. 42. It is likewise called the "feast of ingathering in the end of the year," Exod. xxiii. 16, because at this season the whole harvest, not only of the corn, but also of the vintage and other fruits, for which they were to express their thankfulness to God, at this feast, was completed; Lev. xxiii. 39.

It began on the fifteenth day of the month Tisri, the first of the civil and the seventh of the ecclesiastical year, and was to be celebrated seven days: "The fifteenth day of the seventh month shall be the feast of tabernacles for seven days;" Lev. xxiii. 34. To which there was also added an eighth day, which was to be observed with peculiar solemnity: "Seven days shall ye offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord; on the eighth day shall be an holy convocation unto you, and ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord; it is a solemn assembly, and ye shall do no servile work therein;" ver. 36. But as the feast of tabernacles is expressly limited to seven days, "The fifteenth day of this seventh month shall be the feast of tabernacles for seven days unto the Lord," ver. 34; during which only they are commanded to dwell in tabernacles or booths, ver. 42; this eighth day was not so properly a part of the feast of tabernacles, as another distinct feast which followed immediately upon it; agreeably to the account which is given in the book of Nehemiah, "They kept the feast seven days, and on the eighth day was a solemn as-

* The rabbies say a great deal concerning the form of these tabernacles; see Mishn. tit. Succah, and Surenhusii Tabulæ rarissimorum Tabernaculorum, prefixed to tom. v.

sembly according unto the manner;" chap. viii. 18. The seven days are expressly said in Leviticus to have been kept in commemoration of their dwelling in tents in the wilderness for forty years, chap. xxiii. 42, 43; the eighth day, therefore, was properly the feast of ingathering, on which they were to give thanks for their whole harvest, "after," as it is expressed in the book of Deuteronomy, "they had gathered in their corn and their wine," chap. xvi. 13—16. Indeed, there is no mention, in this last passage, of this eighth day, but only of the festival of seven days. Nevertheless, these being observed on a separate account, namely, to commemorate their dwelling in tents in the wilderness, we may conclude, that the rejoicing and thanksgiving, enjoined at this festival on account of the harvest, were chiefly if not wholly appropriated to the eighth day. And it is observable, that they were commanded to dwell in booths no longer than the seven days; a circumstance which shows, that the eighth day was not observed on the same account as the seven preceding. Nevertheless, as the names of the feast of the passover, and the feast of unleavened bread, which immediately followed it, are frequently confounded,* so the feast of tabernacles and of ingathering, though properly distinct, yet, following close upon one another, are sometimes spoken of as one feast, and the name of either indifferently applied to both. It was probably the eighth day, which is ordered to be kept with the solemnity of a sabbath, and not the seventh, concerning which there is no such appointment in the law, that is styled by the evangelist John "the last and great day of the feast," chap. vii. 37; that is, of the feast of tabernacles; ver. 2.

The first day of this feast was to be kept as a sabbath, Lev. xxiii. 39, and during that and the six following days they were to dwell in tents, or booths, made of branches of several sorts of trees, which are particularly mentioned, ver. 40. The name of the first sort is עץ הדר *gnets hadhar*, which we render, "goodly trees." The Jews will have it to mean the citron.† The next is called תמר *thamar*, or the palm. The third is עץ עבת *gnets gnabhoth*, which signifies any thick or

* See before, chap. iv. p. 478.

† Reland. Antiq. part iv. cap. v. sect. ix.; Hottinger. in Godwin. lib. iii. cap. vi. sect. iii. not. iv. p. 581—584.

bushy wood; by which the Jews understand the myrtle. The last is the willow. But when Nehemiah, upon the revival of this feast, directed the people what branches to gather, he called some of them by different names, which we render olive branches, and pine branches, and myrtle branches; Neh. viii. 15. Probably, therefore, the Karraites were right in their opinion, that it was not the intention of the law to oblige them to use certain trees and no other, but only such as were fit for the purpose, and could be most readily procured, in the places where they dwelt. Accordingly Moses named such trees as were most common in his time, and Nehemiah others that were grown more common in his. It appears from the passage in Nehemiah, that the booths were to be made of these branches; but this is not expressly declared of the boughs mentioned in Leviticus. It is only said, "You shall take on the first day the boughs of goodly trees, branches of palm trees, and the boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brook; and ye shall rejoice before the Lord your God seven days." These boughs and branches the Sadducees understand to be for making their booths; but the Pharisees, that they were to be carried in their hands;* which is the practice of the modern Jews to this day. They tie together one branch of palm, three branches of myrtle, and one of willow. This they carry in their right hands, and in their left they have a branch of citron, with its fruit, or at least of pomecitron, when they cannot procure such a branch. With these, every day of the feast, that is, for seven days, they make a procession in their synagogues round their reading desks, as their ancestors did round the walls of Jericho, in token of the expected down-fal of their enemies.† Under each of these branches a mystery is comprehended. The palm, inasmuch as it bears an insipid fruit, is an emblem of the hypocrite. The myrtle, as it has a fragrant smell, although it be barren, resembles those who perform good works without the law. The willow is an emblem of the wicked, and the citron of the righteous.‡ They also turn about with these branches to the four cardinal points,

* Reland. Antiq. ubi supra; see Joseph. Antiq. lib. iii. cap. x. sect. iv. p. 175, edit. Havere.

† Buxtorf. Synag. Judaic. cap. xxi. p. 460, 461.

‡ Buxtorf. Synag. Judaic. cap. xxi. p. 457, 3d edit.

and shake or push with them each way, and upwards and downwards, to drive the devil from them.* While they are making this procession, they sing Hosannah; whence this feast is called by the rabbies the Hosannah; and sometimes the branches are called by the same name. On the last day, which they call Hosannah Rabbah, or the great Hosannah, they make the procession seven times together, in memory of the siege of Jericho. The form of the Hosannah in their ritual, which they sing on this occasion, is remarkable: "For thy sake, O our Creator, Hosannah; for thy sake, O our Redeemer, Hosannah; for thy sake, O our Seeker, Hosannah;" as if they beseeched the blessed Trinity, saith Dr Patrick,† to save them, and send them help. This feast is kept with the greatest jollity of any of their festivals, especially on the eighth day; when, according to the law, they were to feast and rejoice upon their having gathered in their corn and their wine. Hence, in the Talmud, it is often called חג *chag*, the feast, *κατ' εξοχην*: and Philo calls it *εορτων μεγιστην*, the greatest of the feasts;‡ and hence likewise this Jewish festival came to be more taken notice of by the heathens than any other. It is probable king Cecrops took from it the hint of the law which he ordained at Athens, "that the master of every family should after harvest make a feast for his servants, and eat together with them, who had taken pains with him in tilling his ground."§ And as this Jewish festival was kept at the time of the vintage, or presently after it, when "they had gathered in their corn and their wine," it is not unlikely, that the heathens borrowed their Bacchanalia from it; and this might lead Plutarch into that egregious mistake, that the Jews celebrated this festival to the honour of Bacchus; for he saith in his Symposia,‖ "that in the time of the vintage the Jews spread tables, furnished with all manner of fruits, and lived in tabernacles, especially of palm and ivy wreathed together, and they call it the feast of tabernacles;" "and then a few days after," saith he (referring, I suppose, to the last day

* Buxtorf. cap. xx. p. 459. † Patrick on Lev. xxiii. 40.

‡ See Wolfii Curæ Philolog. in Joh. vii. 37.

§ Macrob. Saturnal. lib. i. cap. x. p. 231, edit. Gronov. Lugd. Bat. 1670.

‖ Plutarch. Sympos. lib. iv. prob. v. Oper. tom. ii. p. 671, edit. Francof. 1620.

of the feast), "they kept another festivity, which openly shows it was dedicated to Bacchus; for they carried boughs of palms, &c., in their hands, with which they went into the temple, the Levites (who, he fancies, were so called from Εὐιος, one of the names of Bacchus) going before with instruments of music," &c.

Although only the first and last days of this feast were to be kept as sabbaths, there were, nevertheless, peculiar and extraordinary sacrifices appointed for every day of it; Numb. xxix. 12, *et seq.* On the first day, "thirteen young bullocks, two rams, and fourteen lambs of the first year," were sacrificed; whereas on the other festivals two bullocks sufficed; see Numb. xxviii. 11. 19. 27. The next day twelve bullocks were sacrificed, and so on, with the decrease of one bullock a day, till on the seventh day only seven bullocks were offered; which in all made seventy bullocks. The lambs and the rams also were in a double proportion to the number sacrificed at any other festival. The doctors give this reason for the daily diminution of the number of the bullocks; the whole number, say they, being seventy, was according to the languages of the seventy nations of the world; and the diminution of one every day signified, that there should be a gradual diminution of those nations till all things were brought under the government of the Messiah.* Others suppose this diminution had a respect to the seventy years of man's age, which is daily decaying.†

For the eighth day, though it was properly a distinct festival, and was to be kept with extraordinary solemnity, fewer sacrifices were appointed than for any of the foregoing seven. On every one of them two rams were offered and fourteen lambs; on this day there were but half as many; and whereas seven bullocks were the fewest that were offered on any of these days, on this there was only one; Numb. xxix. 36. By which, Dr. Patrick saith, God consulted perhaps the weakness of mankind, who naturally grow weary both of the charge and labour of such services, when they are long continued; and therefore he made them every day less toilsome and ex-

* R. Solomon in Numb. xxix. cited by Lightfoot in his Temple Service, chap. xvi. sect. i.

† Abarbanel in Numb. xxix. cited by Lightfoot, ubi supra.

pensive; and put them in mind likewise, that the multitude of sacrifices did not procure their acceptance with God, and that in length of time they would come to nothing, and be utterly abolished, to establish something better in their room.*

Before we dismiss the ceremonies of this feast, we must not forget to mention a very extraordinary one, of which the rabbies inform us, though there is not the least hint of it in the law of Moses, notwithstanding he gives a more particular description of this feast than of any other; namely, the drawing water out of the pool of Siloam, and pouring of it, mixed with wine, on the sacrifice as it lay on the altar.† This they are said to have done with such expressions of joy, that it became a common proverb, "He that never saw the rejoicing of drawing water, never saw rejoicing in all his life."‡ To this ceremony our Saviour is supposed to refer, when "in the last day, the great day of the feast, he stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink: he that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water," John vii. 37, 38: thereby calling off the people from their carnal mirth, and festive and pompous ceremonies, to seek spiritual refreshment for their souls. The Jews pretend to ground this custom on the following passage of Isaiah, "With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation;" chap. xii. 3. This libation was performed every day of the feast, at the time of the morning sacrifice;§ but the greater part of their rejoicing on that occasion was adjourned till evening; when a wild and ridiculous scene of mirth was acted in the court of the temple, by those who were esteemed the wise men of Israel,‖ namely, by the elders and members of the Sanhedrim, the rulers of the synagogues, and doctors of the schools, and such others as were most honoured for their

* See Patrick in loc.

† See this ceremony described in Maimon. de Sacrificiis Jugibus, cap. x. sect. vii. p. 494, 495; Crenii Fascic. Sexti in Annot. Constant. L'Empereur, ad cod. Middoth, cap. ii. sect. v. p. 67—69, edit. Lugd. Bat. 1730; or in Mishn. Surenhus. tom. v. p. 343, 344.

‡ Mishn. tit. Succah, cap. v. sect. i. tom. ii. p. 277, edit. Surenhus.

§ Maimon. ubi supra, sect. vi.

‖ Maimon. in Lulahb. cap. viii. sect. xii. et seq. See the quotations in Talmudis Babylonici codex Succah, by Dachs, not. i. ii. ad cap. v. sect. iv. p. 451, 452, Traject. ad Rhen. 1726.

age and piety. All the temple-music played, and these old men danced, while the women in the balconies round the court, and the men on the ground, were spectators. All the sport was to see these venerable fathers of the nation skip and dance, clap their hands and sing; and they who played the fool most egregiously, acquitted themselves with most honour; for in this they pretend to imitate the example of David, "who danced before the Lord with all his might, and said, I will be yet more vile than this, and be base in my own sight;" 2 Sam. vi. 14. 22. In this manner they spent the greater part of the night, till at length two priests sounded a retreat with trumpets. This mad festivity was repeated every evening, except on the evening before the sabbath which fell in this festival, and on the evening before the last and great day of the feast. It seems, these two evenings were accounted too holy for such ridiculous gambols.*

We can be at no loss for a reason, why the feast of ingathering, which was annexed to the feast of tabernacles, was celebrated at this season of the year, when the vintage, as well as the corn harvest, was newly finished; in respect to which the feast is said, in the book of Exodus, to be "in the end of the year," chap. xxiii. 16, though it was not celebrated till three weeks after the new civil year began; and so the next words seem to explain it, "in the end of the year, when thou hast gathered thy labours out of the field:" in which sense it comes nigh our autumn, the latter end of the year. Or, perhaps, the phrase בצאת השנה *betseeth hashanah*, may admit of a different version, for the verb יצא *jatsa* signifies not only *exiit*, but *ortus est*, in which sense it is applied to the rising of the sun, Gen. xix. 23; Psalm xix. 6; and to the birth of man; Job i. 21; 1 Kings viii. 19; Isa. xi. 1. Accordingly *betseeth hashanah* may be as justly rendered *in ortu anni*, as *in exitu anni;* in the beginning as in the end of the year, and may as properly be applied to the first month as the last. But it is not so obvious, for what reason the feast of tabernacles was fixed to this season. One might naturally expect, that the annual commemoration of their dwelling in tents in the wilderness should be celebrated at the same time of the

* See a larger account of this ceremony in Lightfoot's Temple Service, chap. xvi. sect. iv.

year, when either they first betook themselves to tents on their leaving Egypt presently after the passover, or when they quitted their tents upon their entrance into Canaan, a little before the passover, which was kept in the plains of Jericho; Joshua v. 10: whereas this feast was appointed to be celebrated at near six months' distance from either.

Rabbi Jacob Levita conceives, that, as it was usual with people in warm climates to live much in tents or booths in summer, for coolness, God purposely directed the celebration of this feast to be delayed to that season of the year when the cold mornings, winds, and rains, ordinarily obliged them to quit their booths and betake themselves to their houses; that it might appear, their dwelling in booths at this time was not for convenience or pleasure, but in obedience to the Divine command.* Maimonides, on the contrary, observes, that this feast was wisely fixed to that season, when the people might dwell in booths with the least inconvenience, because the weather was then moderate, and they were not wont to be troubled either with heat or with rain.†

Others have therefore endeavoured to prove, that this was the time of the year when Moses came down the second time from the mount, and brought them the joyful news, that God was appeased for the sin of the golden calf; and that he had accordingly ordered the tabernacle to be reared, in token that now he no longer disdained to dwell among them, in memory of which this feast is supposed to be appointed. However, this is assigning a quite different reason for their dwelling in booths or tabernacles from that which the Scripture assigns; for according to the Scripture this appointment was designed, not in commemoration of God's dwelling in the tabernacle among them, but of their "dwelling in tents forty years in the wilderness."

The learned Joseph Mede's opinion seems to be the most probable, as well as the most ingenious,‡ namely, that this feast was affixed to the time of the year when Christ was to be born, and the dwelling in tabernacles was intended as a type of

* Meyer. de Temporibus et Festis Hebræor. part ii. cap. xvi. sect. iv. p. 318, 319.

† Maimon. Moreh Nevoch. lib. iii. cap. xliii.

‡ Mede's Diatrib. disc. xlviii. p. 268 of his Works, edit. 1677.

his incarnation; as St. John seems to intimate, when he saith, "the word was made flesh, και εσκηνωσεν εν ήμιν, and tabernacled in or with us;" John i. 14.

We are assured by the apostles, that the law in the general had "a shadow of good things to come," Heb. x. 1, or a typical reference to Christ and the gospel dispensation. It is, therefore, incredible, that any of the three grand festivals should be without some illustrious type of him, or should not point to some principal circumstance concerning him; as we know the passover and the pentecost did, the former being a type of his passion, the latter of his sending the first-fruits of his Spirit, on his setting up the gospel kingdom. And can it be imagined, that the third principal feast, which was more solemn than either of the others, having a more extraordinary course of sacrifices annexed to it, should not typically point to some grand event concerning him and his kingdom? And to what can we so naturally apply it, especially after the hints St. John has given us in the passage before quoted, as to the incarnation and birth of our Saviour? The events, then, that were typified by the two former feasts, falling out at the very time of those festivals, it is probable the case was the same as to the feast of tabernacles, and that Christ was born at this festival.*

Of the Time of Christ's Nativity.

As to the vulgar opinion, that the birth of Christ was on the twenty-fifth of December, there is not only no good reason for it, but the contrary.

It is certain, this day was not fixed upon in the Christian church, as the day of our Saviour's nativity, till after the time of Constantine, in the fourth century; and then it was upon a mistaken supposition, that Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, was the high-priest, and that the day when he burnt incense upon the altar in the temple, while the people were

* On the feast of tabernacles, besides the Mishna, tit. Succah, and Dachs, Talmudis Babylon. codex Succah, sive de Tabernaculorum Festo passim, see Meyer. de Temporibus et Festis Diebus Hebræor. part ii. cap. xvi.; Reland. Antiq. part iv. cap. v.; Ainsworth on Levit. xxiii. 34—43; Lightfoot's Temple Service, chap. xvi.; Leidekker. de Republ. Hebr. lib. ix. cap. vii.

waiting without, was the day of expiation, or the tenth of the month Tisri, which fell out that year about the middle of September. As soon as Zacharias had fulfilled the days of his ministration, John the Baptist was conceived, that is, toward the end of September. Our Saviour was conceived six months after, that is, toward the end of March, and consequently his birth must fall out toward the end of December. This is the ground upon which the feast of our Saviour's nativity was fixed to the twenty-fifth of December.* However, that it is erroneous is very evident; for Zacharias was not in the holy of holies, into which the high-priest only entered, when the angel appeared to him; but by the altar of incense, which stood in the sanctuary without the veil, Luke i. 11; at which altar the common priests performed their daily ministry. Neither was Zacharias the high-priest; for we are told, that "he was of the course of Abia," and that his lot "was to burn incense," ver. 5. 9; whereas the high-priest was of no course at all, neither did burning incense in the most holy place fall to him by lot, but was part of his proper and peculiar office. Accordingly there is no reason to conclude, that the day when the angel appeared to Zacharias was the day of expiation, which is the foundation of the common opinion concerning the time of the birth of Christ.

I add farther, that not only is the vulgar opinion of the season of his nativity destitute of any just ground; but there are good and valid arguments against it. For instance,

There was a decree from Cæsar Augustus issued and executed at this season, that all persons, women as well as men, should repair to their respective cities, to be taxed, or enrolled. This occasioned the Virgin Mary to come to Bethlehem at that time; where she was delivered. But surely this decree was not executed in the middle of winter, which was a very severe season in that country, and highly inconvenient for travelling, especially for such multitudes, and in particular for women in Mary's condition; as may be inferred from what our Saviour saith in the twenty-fourth chapter of St. Matthew, concerning the difficulties to which his disciples would be exposed, if their flight, previous to the siege and

* Spanheim. Histor. Eccles. secul. i. sect. ii.; de Nativitate, sect. iii. p. 523, 524; et secul. iv. sect. vi. de Ritibus, p. 855, edit. Lugd. Bat. 1701.

destruction of Jerusalem, should happen in the winter, ver. 20.

Again, at the time when Christ was born, there were shepherds abroad in the fields by night watching their flocks; certainly a very unseasonable service for the winter in Judea, if we may judge of the weather in that country, and at that season, by the Psalmist's description: "He giveth snow like wool, he scattereth the hoar frost like ashes; he casteth forth his ice like morsels; who can stand before his cold?" Psalm cxlvii. 16, 17.

Upon the whole, there is great probability, that Christ was not born in December. But, though we do not pretend to be certain of the real time when he was born, there are, however, several reasons to incline us to believe, it was at the feast of tabernacles; particularly, as was hinted before, the synchronism of the type and the antitype in the two other principal feasts; and the same, therefore, was probably the case as to this feast.

Again, Dr. Lightfoot has offered several arguments, to prove that Christ was baptized at the time of the feast of tabernacles.* But when he was baptized, he was *ὡσει ετων τριακοντα αρχομενος*, that is, entering on his thirtieth year, Luke iii. 23; consequently this was the same time of the year in which he was born.

Farther, Joseph Scaliger observes, that the twenty-four courses of the priests, which went through the year, began with the month Nisan about the vernal equinox; and that consequently the eighth course, to which Zacharias belonged, ministered in the latter part of July. If from thence you reckon the five months to the virgin's conception, and nine more for her gestation, the birth of Christ will fall in the latter end of September, that is, at the season of the feast of tabernacles.†

* See his Harmony on Luke iii. 21.

† See Scalig. Fragment. p. 58, 59, ad Calcem Emend. Temp.; Mede's Diatrib. disc. xlviii. on Deut. xvi. 16; Christ's Birth mistimed, a Tract, No. iv. in the Phœnix, 1707; and in defence of the common opinion, Selden on the Birth-day of our Saviour, apud Opera, vol. iii. tom. vi. p. 1405, et seq.

CHAPTER VII.

OF THE FEAST OF TRUMPETS AND NEW MOONS.

HAVING considered the three grand festivals, at which all the male Israelites, who were able, were obliged to assemble at the national altar, we proceed to consider the lesser feasts, of which some were menstrual, others annual. The menstrual were the new moons, which were kept on the first day of every month; and of these one was more remarkable and to be observed with greater solemnity than the rest; namely, on the first day of the month Tisri. This is styled the "feast of trumpets."

It is proper first to consider the common new moon feast, of which we find no other institution in the law of Moses than merely a prescription of certain sacrifices to be offered on the day of the new moon, or, which is the same, on the first day of the month, over and above the sacrifices that were daily offered; see Numb. xxviii. 11—15.

The sacrifices prescribed on this occasion, are two young bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs, for a burnt-offering, and a kid of the goats for a sin-offering, to be attended with meat offerings and drink-offerings, as usual in other sacrifices.

The number of the animal sacrifices are eleven, for which the Hebrew doctors have devised the following reason, because the lunar year falls short of the solar by eleven days.* We find only one precept more in the law of Moses concerning these new moons; namely, that "in their solemn days, and in the beginning of their months, they shall blow with the trumpets over their burnt-offerings, and over the sacrifices of their peace-offerings;" Numb. x. 10. But this is rather to be considered as a ceremony attending the sacrifices, than as peculiar to the new moon days; for the same thing is enjoined at their other solemn sacrifices, or on their other solemn

* Reland. Antiq. part iv. cap. vii. sect. iv. p. 510, 3d edit.

days, at the several feasts which are instituted in the twenty-third chapter of Leviticus, which were to be proclaimed as holy convocations, ver. 2; and this was always done by sound of trumpets; Numb. x. 7, 8.

Indeed, in the eighty-first Psalm this seems to be mentioned as a rite peculiar to the new moon: "Blow up the trumpet in the new moon, at the time appointed, on the solemn feast day;" ver. 3. But it is probable the new moon, here mentioned, was the feast of trumpets, or the new moon at the beginning of the month Tisri; for the use of which festival Dr. Patrick supposes this Psalm was composed. This was the chief new moon of the year, and was distinguished from the rest by peculiar rites, particularly by the blowing of trumpets, as we shall see hereafter.

The trumpet, or musical instrument, of which Asaph here speaks as to be sounded on the new moon to which he refers, was the שופר *shophar*, made of horn, and therefore sometimes rendered the cornet; whereas the instrument used on the ordinary new moons, or at the beginning of their months, was the חצצרה *chatsotserah*, Numb. x. 10, which was made of silver; ver. 2. Of both these instruments we have formerly given an account.*

The new moon to which Asaph refers was to be kept as a sabbath, for it is called a solemn feast day. But I do not find the ordinary new moons ever so styled; nor does it appear by the law of Moses, that they were to be observed as sacred festivals, or sabbath days, in which no servile work was to be done. They are not mentioned among the sacred feasts in the twenty-third chapter of Leviticus. Nor is any thing prescribed on those days more than the offering of the sacrifices already mentioned: nevertheless, sacrifices relating to and implying devotion in the offerers, those days were accounted more sacred than common ones, and were accordingly observed by pious Israelites for the exercises of devotion; they used at these seasons to repair to the prophets, or other ministers of God, to hear his word. This occasioned the Shunamite's husband inquiring, for what end she desired to go to the prophet that day, "when it was neither new moon nor sabbath;" a plain intimation, that it had been her custom

* See p. 188.

to do it on those days. The new moons and sabbaths are mentioned together, as days of public worship, by several of the prophets. "It shall come to pass," saith the prophet Isaiah, "that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord;" chap. lxvi. 23. Again, "Thus saith the Lord God" (by the prophet Ezekiel), "The gate of the inner court, that looketh toward the east, shall be shut the six working days; but on the sabbath it shall be opened, and on the day of the new moon it shall be opened;" chap. xlvi. 1. And in the following remarkable passage of the prophet Amos: "Hear this, O ye that swallow up the needy, even to make the poor of the land to fail, saying, When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn, and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat?" &c., chap. viii. 4, 5. It appears from this passage, that though the law did not expressly require that they should abstain from servile work on the new moon, as it did on the sabbath, worldly business, notwithstanding, was, in a good measure, laid aside on those days.

Besides the public, national sacrifices that were to be offered on the new moons, it was customary to make feasts, probably on the more private sacrifices offered by particular persons and families; see 1 Sam. xx. 5, 6.

In the opinion of the rabbies, whilst men are allowed to follow their vocations on the new moons, as on other days, the women were exempted from all labour. For they pretend, the new moon is in a peculiar manner the festival of the women, in commemoration of their liberality at the time of erecting the tabernacle, in contributing their most valuable jewels to promote the magnificence of the divine service, which memorable action was performed, they say, on the new moon of the month Nisan.*

It does not appear in Scripture by what method the ancient Jews fixed the time of the new moon, and whether they kept this feast on the day of the conjunction, or on the first day of the moon's appearing. The rabbies are of the latter opinion. They tell us, that, for want of astronomical tables, the Sanhedrim, about the time of the new moon, sent out men to watch

* See Buxtorf's Synag. Judaic. cap. xxii. p. 473, 474, 3d edit.; et Leidekker. de Republ. Hebræor. lib. ix. cap. ii. p. 538, 539, Amstel. 1704.

upon the tops of mountains, and give immediate notice to them of its first appearance; upon which a fire was made on the top of Mount Olivet, which, being seen at a distance, was answered by fires on the tops of other mountains, and they in like manner by others still more remote; by which means the notice was quickly spread through the whole land. But experience at length taught them, that this kind of intelligence was not to be depended on, the Samaritans, and other profane persons, sometimes kindling such fires on the tops of mountains at a wrong season, on purpose to deceive the people, and disturb the order of the sacred festivals. In later times, therefore, the Sanhedrim was forced to send expresses on this occasion to all parts of the country.

It is farther added, that because of the uncertainty that would attend this way of fixing the time of the new moon, especially in cloudy weather, they observed two days, that they might be secure of being in the right.* Hence they account for Saul's expecting David at his table two days successively, on the feast of the new moon; 1 Sam. xx. 24.

The modern Jews keep this festival by repeating certain prayers in their synagogues, and afterward by feasting in their own houses:† and some devotees fast on the vigil of it.‡

Many of them add another ceremony about three days after. They meet in companies in the night in some open place, when they bless God, in a prayer of considerable length, for having created the moon, and for having renewed her, to teach the Israelites that they ought to become new creatures. Then they leap up thrice in the air as high as they are able, and say to the moon, "As we leap up toward thee without being able to touch thee, so may it be impossible for our enemies to rise up against us to hurt us."§

The reason of God's appointing peculiar sacrifices to be offered at the new moon might be, in part, to make the time of it more carefully observed; which was a matter of considerable importance, not only to prevent confusion in their

* See above, chap. i. p. 416.

† Buxtorf. Synag. cap. xxiv. p. 500. 504.

‡ Buxtorf. cap. xxiii. p. 489.

§ See Basnage's History of the Jews, book v. chap. xiv. sect. ix. p. 451, 452.

chronology, since they reckoned by lunar months, but likewise because the true time of observing all their great festivals depended upon it. Nevertheless, I conceive the chief reason of this institution was to preserve the Israelites from the idolatry of the heathens, who used to offer sacrifices to the new moon. Thus, among the Athenians, the first day of the month was τη ἱερωτατη ἡμερων, a most holy day, as Plutarch styles it.* And there was a law, ταις νουμηνιαις θυειν, to offer sacrifices on the new moons.† Some indeed have observed so great a resemblance in several articles of the Athenian law to that of Moses, as to suspect, that the Athenian lawgiver took the hint of many of them from the Jewish institutions. Be that as it will, nothing is more likely than that as the sun and the moon were the principal idols the heathens worshipped, it was usual for them to pay their devotions to the moon, probably by sacrifices, chiefly at the time of her first appearing after the change. In order, therefore, to check this species of idolatry, God commanded the Israelites to offer solemn sacrifices to him at the same time that the heathens were sacrificing to the moon. Accordingly it is very observable, that the sin-offering on this occasion, which was to be a kid of the goats, is particularly and expressly directed to be offered to Jehovah; Numb. xxviii. 15. The design of this, Grotius observes, was to put them in mind of the right object of worship at a time when they were in peculiar danger of being seduced to offer sacrifices to the moon, after the manner of the heathens: which remark is the more worthy of notice, in that, though in the same chapter a goat is ordered to be sacrificed for a sin-offering, both at the feast of the passover and at pentecost (ver. 22—30), yet it is not said in either instance, that it must be offered to Jehovah, though it was, no doubt, so intended; in all probability because there was no such danger of this kind of idolatry at those seasons as there was at the new moon. Maimonides likewise hath observed, that "this sin-offering is so peculiarly said to be unto the Lord, lest any should think this goat to be a sacrifice to the moon, after the manner of the Egyptians, who used to sacrifice one to the

* Plutarch. de Vitando ære alieno, Oper. tom. ii. p. 828, A. edit. Francof. 1620.

† Vid. Petiti Comment. in Leges Atticas, lib. i. tit. i. p. 85.

moon at this time, as they did to the sun at his rising."* And it seems, among the heathens, the goat was a favourite sacrifice to the moon, because the horns of that animal somewhat resemble the new moon.† Thus much for the common new moon.

The new moon which began the month Tisri, the seventh of the ecclesiastical, but the first of the civil year, was to be observed with more than ordinary solemnity, not only with several sacrifices additional to those that were offered on other new moons, but it was to be kept as a sabbath, in which they were to have a holy convocation, and to do no servile work. And besides the sounding the trumpets over the sacrifices, as on the other new moons and solemn festivals, this was to be "a day of blowing the trumpets," Numb. xxix. 1; that is, as the ancient Jews understand it, they were to be blown from morning to evening;‡ at least it imports they were to be blown more on this day than on any other.

This day is also called "a memorial of blowing of trumpets;" Lev. xxiii. 24.§

The Scripture nowhere expressly assigning the reason of this festival, and particularly of the blowing of trumpets, from whence it is called the feast of trumpets, the learned are very much divided about it. Maimonides thinks it was instituted to awaken the people to repentance against the annual fast, or great day of expiation, which followed nine days after. He makes the sound of the trumpet on this day to be in effect saying, "Shake off your drowsiness, ye that sleep, search and try your ways, remember your Creator and repent, bethink yourselves and take care of your souls," &c.‖

Some have supposed, that the apostle refers to this use and meaning of blowing the trumpets in the following passage of the Epistle to the Ephesians: "Wherefore he saith, Awake,

* Moreh Nevoch. part iii. cap. xlvi. præsertim, p. 488.

† Spencer, de Legibus Hebræor. lib. iii. dissert. iv. cap. i. sect. v. p. 814, tom. ii. edit. Cantab. 1727.

‡ Munster. in loc.; et Buxtorf. Synag. cap. xxiv. p. 504.

§ See the institution of this festival, Numb. xxix. 1—6; Lev. xxiii. 24, 25.

‖ Maimon. de Pœnitentiâ, cap. iii. sect. vi. p. 56, edit. et vers. Clavering. Oxon. 1705. See also Moreh Nevoch. part iii. cap. xliii. p. 471, 472, edit. Buxtorf. 1629; and Shom Tobh on Maimonides, quoted by Hottinger on Godwin, lib. iii. cap. vii. sect. vi. not. iv. p. 601.

thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light;" chap. v. 14. Accordingly they make the nominative case to λεγει, he saith, to be θεος. God, as speaking by the voice or sound of the trumpet. To this it may be objected, not only that there is no intimation in Scripture, that the trumpets were blown for the purposes Maimonides imagines, but likewise that the apostle would hardly have referred to a Jewish ceremony, as if the meaning of it were well known, when he was writing to the Gentiles, who probably were unacquainted with the ceremony itself, and much more with its design and intention. Others, therefore, suppose the nominative case to λεγει is γραφη, the Scripture, or God speaking in the Scripture, and that there is a reference to the following passage of Isaiah: "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee," chap. lx. 1; quoted by the apostle, though not verbatim, yet according to the sense; while others apprehend the allusion is not so much to any particular passage as to the general and principal design of the sacred oracles, which evidently is to awaken, convert, and save sinners.

It is an ingenious conjecture of Heumannus,* that this passage is taken out of one of those hymns, or spiritual songs, which were in common use in the Christian church in those times, and which are mentioned by the apostle in a subsequent passage, "Speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs;" Eph. v. 19. This author observes, that it consists of three metrical lines,

Εγειραι ὁ καθευδων,
Και αναστα εκ των νεκρων,
Και επιφαυσει σοι ὁ Χριστος.

As for διο λεγει, he makes it to be the same with διο λεγεται, "wherefore it is said," as in Rom. xv. 10. But, on supposition that these lines were taken out of some hymns or spiritual songs, known to have been composed by inspiration, I should rather think the nominative case to λεγει may be θεος, or πνευμα ἁγιον. To return to the subject we are upon:—

It may be farther objected to Maimonides and some other Jews, who conceive the design of blowing the trumpets was

* Poeciles, tom. ii. lib. ii. p. 390, as cited by Wolfius, Curæ Philologicæ in loc.

to awaken men to repentance, that זכרון תרועה *zickron terungnah*, which we render, "a memorial of blowing the trumpets," Levit. xxiii. 24, properly signifies a memorial of triumph, or shouting for joy; for, as Dr. Patrick observes,* the word תרועה *terungnah* is never used in Scripture but for a sound or shout of rejoicing, as the Chaldee יבבא *jabbaba*, by which Onkelos renders it, always signifies.†

Other Jews, therefore, make the blowing of the trumpet to be a memorial of Isaac's deliverance by means of the ram, which was substituted to be sacrificed in his stead. Accordingly they say, the trumpets blown on this day must be made of rams' horns; and such are those which the modern Jews blow in their synagogues.‡

They sound the horn thirty times, sometimes slow and sometimes quick. If the trumpeter sounds it clear and well, they reckon it a presage of a happy year; if otherwise, they express their concern by the sadness of their countenances, esteeming it an unfavourable omen. When he hath done, the people repeat these words loudly and distinctly,§ "Blessed is the people that know the joyful sound; they shall walk, O Lord, in the light of thy countenance;" Psalm lxxxix. 15. And when they return from the synagogue, their salutation to one another is, "Mayest thou be written in a good year;" the reply, "And thou also."‖

Some of the Christian fathers, particularly Basil¶ and Theodoret,** make the sounding of the trumpets on this day to be a memorial of the giving of the law at mount Sinai, which was attended with the sound of a trumpet; Exod. xix. 16. But the opinion more generally embraced, both by Jews and Christians, is, that it was a memorial of the creation of the world, at which the "sons of God shouted for joy," Job xxxviii. 7; and which is supposed, not altogether without reason, to have been at this season of the year. The month Tisri, therefore, was not only anciently, but is still, reckoned

* Patrick on Numb. xxix. 1.

† See Chaldee Paraphrase on Numb. xxix. 1.

‡ Abarbanel in Levit. xxiii. 24.

§ Buxtorf. Synag. Judaic. cap. xxiv. p. 502.

‖ Buxtorf, p. 497, 498. ¶ Basil in Psalm lxxxi.

** Theodoret. Questiones in Levit. quæst. xxxii.

by the Jews the first month of the year; and the feast of tabernacles, which was kept in this month, was said to be תקופת השנה *tekuphath hashanah,* Exod. xxxiv. 22, which we render "at the end," but in the margin more truly, "at the revolution of the year;" importing, that at this season the year had revolved, and was beginning anew. So that the feast of trumpets was indeed the new year's day, on which the people were solemnly called to rejoice in a grateful remembrance of all God's benefits to them through the last year, which might be intended by blowing the trumpets; as well as to implore his blessing upon them for the ensuing year, which was partly the intention of the sacrifices on this day offered.

The modern Jews have a notion, which they derive from the Mishna,* that on this day God judges all men, who pass before him as a flock before the shepherd. Therefore, as Basnage saith, their zealots spend some a whole month beforehand, others four days, and especially the eve of this feast, in confessing their sins, beating their breasts, and some in lashing their bare backs by way of penance, in order to procure a favourable judgment on this decisive day. He adds, if Christians should be told that they have derived their vigils, their whipcord discipline, and the merit annexed to them, from the Jews, though they would not be pleased, it is nevertheless probable.†

As for the long account which Godwin gives us of the translation of feasts, it is mere rabbinical trifling, without the least foundation in the sacred oracles, and, of consequence, utterly unworthy our attention.‡

* Mishn. tit. Rosh Hashanah, cap. i. sect. ii. tom. i. p. 311.

† See Basnage's History of the Jews, book v. chap. xiii. On the feast of trumpets, see Meyer. de Tempor. et Festis Diebus Hebræor.

‡ Vid. Bochart. Hieroz. part i. lib. ii. cap. i. Oper. tom. ii. p. 561, 562, Lugd. Bat. 1712.

CHAPTER VIII.

OF THE DAY OF EXPIATION.

GODWIN styles this day the feast of expiation, whereas it was altogether a fast, a day of deep humiliation, and of "afflicting their souls."* Nevertheless he is so inconsistent with himself, that he understands the fast mentioned in the account of St Paul's voyage to Rome, Acts xxvii. 9, to be meant of the day of expiation. It is true there is no express injunction in the law of Moses, nor anywhere in the Old Testament, to fast on this solemnity. But that it was understood to be a fast by the Jews appears from Josephus† and Philo,‡ who both style this day *νηστεια*, "the fast." The rabbies commonly distinguish it by the name of צמא רבה *tsoma rabba*, the great fast.§ Tertullian likewise, speaking of the two goats that were offered on this day, saith, *jejunio offerebantur* they were offered on the fast.‖

As for the fast mentioned in the account of St. Paul's voyage, and concerning which it is said, that "sailing was now dangerous, because the fast was now past," Acts xxvii. 9; Castalio, not being able to conceive what a Jewish fast could have to do with sailing, supposes there is an error in the Greek copy, and that instead of *νηστειαν* it should be *νηνεμιαν*, which signifies calm weather; and according to him the meaning is, that sailing was now dangerous, because the fine weather, or calm season, was now over. However, all the manuscripts and ancient versions remonstrate against this emendation; and, indeed, there is no need of it, to support even

* See an account of the institution of this annual solemnity, Lev. xvi., and chap. xxiii. 27—32.

† Joseph. Antiq. lib. iii. cap. x. sect. iii. p. 172.

‡ Philo de Vitâ Mosis, lib. ii. Oper. p. 508, F, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

§ Midrasch Ruth. xlvi. 4, et Echa Rabbati, lxxx. 1, quoted by Reland, Antiq. part iv. cap. vi. sect. i. p. 492.

‖ Tertullian adversus Judæos, cap. xiv. Oper. p. 201, C, edit. Rigalt.

Castalio's own sense of the passage; for this Jewish fast being kept on the tenth day of the month Tisri, a little after the autumnal equinox, it is in fact the same thing to say the fast was already past, or the calm season of the year was over.

Before the invention and use of the compass, sailing was rarely practised in the winter months; and it was reckoned very dangerous to put to sea after the autumnal equinox. Hesiod observes, that at the going down of the Pleiades navigation is dangerous;* and the going down of the Pleiades, he saith, was in autumn, when after harvest they begin to plough.† Again, speaking of safe and prosperous sailing, for which he allots fifty days after the summer solstice, he admonishes to make haste, and get home before the time of new wine, and the autumnal storms, which make the sea difficult and dangerous.‡ Philostratus, in his Life of Apollonius Tyaneus,§ saith, that at the latter end of autumn the sea was more unsettled. And Philo speaks of the beginning of autumn as the last season that was fit for navigation.‖ These testimonies sufficiently demonstrate, that when the sacred historian declares, that "sailing was now dangerous, because the fast was already past," he speaks according to the common sense and apprehension of those times; and he likewise ascertains the season of the year, when this fast was kept, to be about or soon after the autumnal equinox; which, answering to the time of the day of expiation among the Jews, renders it highly probable, that this was the particular fast to which the writer of the Acts refers. As to the objection of Erasmus Schmidius,¶ that it is improbable these Alexandrian mariners should denominate the seasons of the year from Jewish fasts or festivals, he should have observed, that the passage under consideration is not the words of the Alexandrian mariners, but of Luke the historian, who was a Jew by nation, and no doubt, therefore, denominated the seasons from some Jewish fast, according to the custom of his country.

* Hesiod, Opera et Dies, lib. ii. l. 236—240.
† Hesiod, lib. ii. l. 2. ‡ Hesiod, lib. ii. l. 281—295.
§ Philostrat. in Vitâ Apollonii, lib. iv. cap. iv. p. 168, A, edit. Paris, 1608.
‖ Philo, Legat. ad Caium, Oper. p. 770, B, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.
¶ Erasmus Schmidius in loc.

Scaliger* conceives the fast here referred to was that in the month Tebeth, or the tenth month, answering to our December or January; which fast is mentioned by the prophet Zechariah, chap. viii. 19, and was kept in memory of Nebuchadnezzar's sitting down before Jerusalem, to besiege it, on the tenth day of the month; 2 Kings xxv. 1. Scaliger has been followed in this opinion by several others: but is confuted by Hasæus,† who shows, that sailing was absolutely disused, both by the Romans and Greeks, in the depth of winter. The Romans shut up the sea, or forbad sailing, from the third of the ides of November to the sixth of the ides of March; that is, from November the twenty-second to March the twenty first; and it appears by Theophrastus,‡ that the Grecks opened the sea at their Dionysia, or feast of Bacchus, which was kept in March. It is, therefore, altogether improbable, or rather incredible, that the ship in which Paul sailed should put to sea soon after the fast of the tenth month. It remains, then, that the fast here intended must be the day of expiation, which fell out in our September or October.

This account from Hasæus will likewise explain the reason of Paul and his companions stopping three months at Melita, before they could get a passage to Italy. "After three months we departed in a ship of Alexandria, which had wintered in the isle;" Acts xxviii. 11. Now, supposing they first put to sea at the beginning or middle of October, yet sailing slowly, and much time being spent before their shipwreck, chap. xxvii. 7. 9, probably they did not arrive at Melita till the middle of December; and there they were forced to stay till the sea was opened in the spring, or till the law allowed them to put to sea again in March.

Upon the whole, as there is great reason to conclude that the fast, which was lately past at the beginning of Paul's voyage, was the day of expiation; we may from hence infer, that this day was kept as a fast by the Jews; though, as we before observed, fasting is not expressly enjoined in the Mo-

* De Emendat. Tempor. cited by Wolfius, Curæ Philologicæ in Act. xxvii. 9.

† See his Discourse de Computatione Mensium Paulini Itineris, in the Bibliotheca Bremensis, class. i. p. 17, et seq.

‡ Theophrast. Charact. Ethic. cap. iv. alias iii.

saic institution, unless it was included, or, as some have thought, directly intended in the words "Ye shall afflict your souls;" Lev. xvi. 29. This seems to be the meaning of the same expression in the following passage of Isaiah: "Is it such a fast that I have chosen? a day for a man to afflict his soul? Is it to bow down his head as a bulrush, and to spread sackcloth and ashes under him? Wilt thou call this a fast, and an acceptable day to the Lord?" chap. lviii. 5. Among the several external rites here particularly specified, as belonging to a fast, and as carefully observed by the hypocritical Jews, there is nothing said of their abstinence from food, which undoubtedly belonged to a fast, and might naturally have been expected to have been mentioned on this occasion, unless it be intended by the phrase, "afflicting their souls." By the soul we may understand the sensitive part of man, which is afflicted by fasting. Accordingly David saith, that he had "humbled his soul with fasting;" Ps. xxxv. 13. The word here translated humbled is the same which in Leviticus is rendered afflicted. And if by the soul we understand the rational soul, or mind, some have observed a natural connexion between afflicting the soul with a deep, penitential sense of sin, and bodily fasting; inasmuch as great grief never fails to pall the appetite, and incline men to fast; and therefore "afflicting their souls" very naturally implies abstinence from food. Hence, perhaps, the light of nature hath led men to practise fasting, as a proper token and evidence of inward contrition. Thus the Ninevites, though heathens, proclaimed a fast of strict abstinence from food, when they were threatened with speedy destruction; Jonah iii. 5. 7. We find, indeed, no Scripture example of religious fasting before the institution of this annual fast by Moses; yet this silence concerning it will by no means prove it was never practised. But from the time of Moses the Jewish history abounds with instances and examples of this sort. After the unexpected defeat before Ai, Joshua and all the elders of Israel continued prostrate before the ark from morning to night, Josh. vii. 6; which must therefore be without eating. The same was practised by the eleven tribes, upon the desolation which had befallen the tribe of Benjamin; they "wept, and sat there before the Lord, and fasted that day until evening;" Judges xx. 26:

and again by all the people at Mizpeh, in token of their repentance for having served Baalim and other strange gods, 1 Sam. vii. 6; and particularly by David, in hopes of saving the life of the child which he had by Bathsheba, 2 Sam. xii. 16; and on other occasions, when, as he saith in the before-cited passage, he "humbled his soul with fasting."

Besides the annual fast in the seventh month, we read of three others kept by the Jews after their return from the captivity; one in the fourth month, another in the fifth, another in the tenth; Zech. viii. 19. The later Jews had so multiplied them, that they filled almost half their calendar.

According to the rabbies, the fast we are now speaking of was to be observed with extraordinary strictness: they mention six things in particular, which they were that day to abstain from; namely, eating, drinking, washing, anointing themselves, wearing shoes, at least those made of leather, and the use of the marriage-bed.*

This fast being called a sabbath, and being kept like a sabbath, by their abstaining from all servile work (Lev. xvi. 31), as probably their other fasts were, might occasion the error of those heathen writers, who represent the Jews as fasting on their weekly sabbaths. Suetonius cites Octavius saying, in an epistle to Tiberius, "Ne Judæus quidem, mi Tiberi, tam diligenter sabbatis jejunium servat quam ego hodie servavi:" a Jew does not observe the fast of his sabbath so carefully as I have done to-day.† And Justin saith of Moses, "Quo (sc. ad montem Synæ) septem dierum jejunio per deserta Arabiæ cum populo suo fatigatus, cum tandem venisset septimum diem, more gentis sabbatum appellatum, in omne ævum jejunium sacravit, quoniam illa dies famem illis erroremque finierat:" that, arriving at Mount Sinai, after wandering and fasting in the deserts of Arabia seven days, he consecrated every seventh day, called the sabbath, for a perpetual fast, because that day had put a period to their wandering and hunger.‡

* Mishn. tit. Joma, cap. viii. sect. i. tom. ii. p. 252, Surenhus.

† Sueton. in Vit. Octav. cap. lxxvi. p. 473, 474, tom. i. edit. Pitisci, Traject. ad Rhen. 1690.

‡ Justin. lib. xxxvi. cap. ii. sect. xiv. p. 524, edit. Grævii, Lugd. Bat. 1701.

This annual fast is called in the Hebrew יום הכפרים *jom hacchipurim*, the day of atonement, κατ' εξοχην, Lev. xxiii. 27, because of the extraordinary expiatory sacrifices offered thereon, and because the rites which the law prescribed to be then used, were more eminently typical of the ministry of our great high-priest Jesus Christ, and of the atonement made by him for the sins of his people, than those which appertained to any other festival. And whereas other expiatory sacrifices atoned for particular sins, and the sins of particular persons, the Jews say, the sacrifices of this day atoned for all the sins of the foregoing year, and that of the whole nation.* They add likewise, that on this day Satan had no power to do any harm to their nation, as he had on the other three hundred and sixty-four days of the year. Which opinion is abundantly confirmed by the cabalists; for they find that the letters of the word השטן *hasatan*, make, according to their gematria, three hundred sixty and four.†

Several reasons are assigned by the Jews for God's fixing this annual fast and expiation to the tenth day of the month Tisri. For instance, their tradition saith, this was the day on which Adam repented of his transgression, and God was reconciled to him; and the day also on which Abraham was circumcised; and therefore they were in so particular a manner to repent of and atone for their transgressions of God's covenant, on this day, when they (as being included in their father Abraham) were first taken into covenant with God.‡

Farther, the rabbies tell us, this was the day on which Moses came down the last time from the mount, having received the second table from God, with an assurance of his having pardoned their sin of the golden calf, and therefore it was annually to be kept as a day of expiation and plenary remission.§

* Mishn. tit. Joma, cap. iii. sect. viii. With respect to offences against their neighbours, the expiation was on condition the offended persons were appeased. See sect. ix.

† Buxtorf. Synag. Judaic. cap. xxvi. p. 535, 3d edit.

‡ Abarbanel in Lev. xxiii. cited by Meyer. de Temporibus et Festis Hebræor. part ii. cap. xv. sect. iii. p. 309, 310; and more fully by Nicolai, Annot. in Cunæum de Republ. Hebræor. lib. ii. cap. iv. not. i. p. 223, 224, Lugd. Bat. 1703.

§ Maimon. Moreh Nevoch. part. iii. cap. xliii.

It was probably on this last Jewish tradition that Mohammed founded the institution of his annual fast on the month Ramadan, in which he saith the Koran was sent down from heaven.*

On these Jewish traditions we can have no dependence: nor need we be solicitous to discover the reason of God's appointing the tenth of the month Tisri for the day of expiation in preference to any other, since the absolute silence of Scripture concerning it is a sufficient indication, that the knowledge of it is of no importance.

We have only to observe farther concerning the time of this fast, that it was to be kept from evening to evening, Lev. xxiii. 32; which expression, as it is peculiar to this day, and is not used concerning the weekly sabbath, or any other festival, the Jews understand to import more than a natural day; or that this fast was to comprehend the evening, or some of the latter part, of the ninth day, as well as the whole tenth. Although, therefore, the tenth day of the month is appointed for the day of atonement, ver. 27, yet it is said, ver. 32, "Ye shall afflict your souls in the ninth day at evening." Accordingly they are said to have begun this half an hour before sun-set on the ninth, and to have continued it till half an hour after sun-set on the tenth. So that this sabbath was an hour longer than any other.† It is therefore called in the Talmud יומא *joma*, the day, by way of eminence, and by the Hellenistic Jews, *σαββατον σαββατων*.

We now proceed to the consideration of those rites with which the day of expiation was to be observed. And here from the rabbies I might give you a long detail of those which were preparatory, and were used for several days beforehand; especially relating to the high-priest, who on this day was to perform the most solemn part of all his ministry. They tell us, that, leaving his own house, he constantly resided in an apartment of the temple for a week before, and during every day practised the sacred rites, such as sprinkling the blood of the daily sacrifices, burning incense, &c., that he might be expert in performing the peculiar duties of his office on the day

* Sale's Translation of the Koran, chap. ii. p. 21.

† Maimon. de Solennitate Expiationum, cap. i. sect. vi. p. 823, 824, Crenii Fasciculi Septimi.

of expiation. And lest after all he should be ignorant or unmindful of them, the Sanhedrim sent elders to read the ceremonial to him, to direct him in the service requisite on this occasion, and to swear him not to make any alteration in it.* But, as Basnage very justly observes, the Talmudists make no scruple to invent ceremonies unknown to their fathers;† we shall therefore pass over the rites mentioned by them without any farther notice, and attend only to those that are prescribed in the divine law.

Besides fasting, spoken of before, this day was to be kept with all the strict and religious regard of a sabbath, Lev. xxiii. 32; xvi. 29; and with offering sacrifices, first for the high-priest and his family, and then for the people; Heb. vii. 27.‡

The victims offered on this day, including the daily burnt-offerings, were fifteen. The two first were a bullock and a ram, and were designed to make atonement for the "high-priest himself, and for his house;" by which is probably meant the other priests, and perhaps the whole tribe of Levi; for the priests are called "the house of Aaron;" Psalm cxv. 10. 12; and cxxxv. 19. However, Rabbi Jehuda, understanding by the high-priest's house chiefly his wife, makes it so necessary for him to have a wife on this day, that, if she died, he must marry another, that he might satisfy the law, by making expiation for himself and his wife. But this opinion is rejected by the other rabbies.§

Of the victims, none are more remarkable than the two goats, which the high-priest was to receive from the congregation, and to set them before the tabernacle, casting lots, which of the two should be immediately sacrificed, and which should be sent alive into the wilderness, after the sins of the people had been confessed over him, and laid as it were upon him. The manner in which these lots were cast does not appear in Scripture. But if we may credit the rabbies, there

* Mishn. tit. Joma, cap. i. sect. i.—v. p. 206—209, tom. ii. edit. Surenhusii; Maimon. de Solenni Die Expiationum, cap. i. sect. iii.—v. p. 653—655, Crenii Fascic. Septimi. See also Buxtorf. de Synag. cap. xxv. xxvi.

† Basnage's History of the Jews, book v. chap. xiii. sect. vi. p. 448.

‡ See an account of these sacrifices in Lev. xvi. 3. 5. 8, and Numb. xxix. 7—11.

§ Mishn. tit. Joma, cap. i. sect. i. cum notis Maimon. et Bartenor. in loc. p. 206, tom. ii. edit. Surenhus.

was an urn brought to the high-priest, into which he threw two wooden lots, on one of which was written, "For the Lord;" on the other, "For עזאזל *gnazazel*," the word which we render the scape-goat. After he had shaken them, he put both his hands into the urn, and brought up the lots, one in each hand; and as the goats stood one on each side of him, their fate was determined by the lot that came up in the hand next to them. If the right hand brought up the lot for the Lord, they regarded it as a good omen. This, they say, fell out through the whole priesthood of Simeon the Just. If the left hand brought up that lot, they accounted it as a bad omen, and an indication that God was not pacified.*

The goat, on which the lot fell for life, is called in the Hebrew עזאזל *gnazazel*, Lev. xvi. 8; concerning the meaning of which word there are divers opinions. The chief are the three following:—

1st. The most common opinion is, that עזאזל *gnazazel* is a name given to the goat itself, on account of his being let go; as being derived from עז *gnez*, a goat, and אזל *azel*, *abiit*, to go away. Thus it is explained by Buxtorf,† and by Paulus Fagius,‡ and many others;§ and so it was understood by our translators, who therefore render it a scape-goat; the Septuagint likewise renders it *αποπομπαιος*, and the Vulgate, *emissarius*. To this interpretation it is, however, objected, that עז *gnaz*, signifying a she-goat, אזל *azel*, which is the third person masculine, cannot agree with it. Bochart, therefore, derives *gnazazel* from the Arabic word *gnazala*, signifying to remove or separate; and understands by it a separate place, or wilderness.‖ But others perceive no occasion to have recourse to the Arabic, as with respect to compound words such an enallage generis is not uncommon in the Hebrew.¶

* Mishn. tit. Joma, cap. iii. sect. ix. p. 223, tom. ii.; et Maimon. de Solenni Die Expiationum, cap. iii. sect. i.—iii. p. 665—668, Crenii Fascic. Septimi.

† Buxtorf. Lexic. Hebraic. et Chaldaic. in verb.

‡ Fagius in loc. apud Criticos Sacros.

§ Francisc. Turretine de Veritate Satisfact. Christi, part iii. sect. xxiv. p. 141, Genevæ, 1666.

‖ Bochart. Hierozoic. part i. lib. ii. cap. liv. p. 653, et seq.

¶ Vid. Witsii Œconom. Fœder. lib. iv. cap. vi. sect. liii. p. 506, edit. Leovard. 1677. Mr. Jones, in his MS. Lectures on Godwin, observes, that the word עז *gnez*, seems to be of the epicene gender. Non diffitendum est

2dly. The second opinion, espoused by Le Clerc,* is, that *gnazazel* was the name of a place, either a mountain or cliff, to which the goat was led, and from thence, as the rabbies say, he was cast down and killed.† In favour of this it is alleged, that the words in the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus, "He that let go the goat," לעזאזל *langnazazel*, cannot be properly rendered any other way than *to gnazazel*, which intimates, that *gnazazel* must be a place.

To this it is objected, that those who have examined the geography of the Holy Land have never been able to point out any place of that name, except in an anonymous writer of very little credit, mentioned by Aben-Ezra, who speaks of such a mountain near Mount Sinai, which must have been too far distant for the scape-goat to have been conducted thither from Jerusalem. Besides, Moses usually prefixes the word mount to the proper name of any mountain, as Mount Hebor, Mount Gerizim,‡ &c.

3dly. The third opinion is that of Spencer,§ who is followed by Witsius,‖ Coccejus,¶ Altingius,** Meyer,†† and others,

quidem, inquit ille, quin עז *gnez*, quam plurimum in Scripturis usurpatur in genere fæmineo; sed non inde sequitur quod ea vox nunquam in masculino fuit usurpata; revera vero potius vox epicena videtur, quæ utrique generi tribui possit, quum pluralem format more masculinorum; et quod revera ita est ex Gen. xxx. 32, 33, constare videtur; procul dubio enim hircos æque ac capras habuit Labanus, et quamvis ibi Com. 35, usurpantur adjectiva fæminei generis, tamen cap. xxxi. 8, eadem adjectiva de iisdem rebus in masculino usurpantur.

* This is the opinion of R. Bechai, R. Solomon, R. Levi Ben Gerson, Aben-Ezra, and other Jewish writers, and of Cunæus, Vatablus, Schindler, and other Christians. See Nicolai, Annot. in Cunæum, lib. ii. cap. vi. It is likewise the opinion of Hottinger; see his notes on Godwin.

† Mishn. tit. Joma, cap. vi. sect. vi. cum not. Sheringham. tom. ii. p. 243, 244, edit. Surenhus.; Targum Jonathan Ben Uziel in Lev. xvi. 10, apud Walton Polyglot. tom. iv.; Maimon. de Solenni Die Expiationum, cap. iii. sect. vii. p. 674, Crenii Fascicul. Septimi.

‡ See Bochart. Hierozoic. part i. lib. ii. cap. liv. p. 653; Spencer. de Legibus, lib. iii. dissert. viii. cap. i. sect. i. p. 1040.

§ Spencer, ubi supra, sect. ii. p. 1041.

‖ De Œconom. Fœder. lib. iv. cap. vi. sect. lxv. lxvi. p. 513, edit. Leovard. 1677; et Ægyptiaca, lib. ii. cap. ix. sect. iii. p. 120, Amstel. 1696.

¶ Comment. in Heb. ix. 25.

** Alting. ad Lev. xvi. Oper. tom. i. p. 82, 83.

†† Meyer. de Festis Hebræor. part ii. cap. xv. sect. xvi. p. 315, 316.

that *gnazazel* was the name of the devil, who was worshipped by the heathens, and particularly by the Egyptians, in the form of a goat.* Hence Juvenal saith of Egypt,

——— Nefas illic fœtum jugulare capellæ.
Sat. xv. l. 11.

because there the goat was honoured as a god.

According to this interpretation of *gnazazel*, it is supposed by some, that both the goats were typical of Christ, that which was sacrificed signifying his death, and the other which was sent to *gnazazel*, his being exposed to and overcoming the power of the devil. Dr. Patrick objects to this opinion, that though it hath been espoused by very great men, it is difficult to conceive, that, when the other goat was offered to God on his altar, this should be sent among the demons who delighted in desert places. Nor will it accord with the Hebrew text, which saith, this goat was for *gnazazel*, as the other was for the Lord. Now surely none will imagine, that both these goats being "set before," and presented to "the Lord," as equally consecrated to him, Lev. xvi. 10, he would order one of them for himself, and the other for the devil, especially as he soon after expressly commanded the Israelites "no more to offer their sacrifices unto devils," שעירים *sengnirim*, "Hircis, sive Dæmonibus hirci formibus;" Lev. xvii. 7. And though Spencer will not allow that the goat, which, he saith, was sent to *gnazazel*, or to the devil, was to be considered as a proper sacrifice to him, but only as being delivered into his power, and given up to his disposal; nevertheless, as the former goat, upon whom the lot to the Lord fell, was a sacrifice to the Lord, so the same expression being used concerning the goat on whom fell the lot to *gnazazel*, if the word *gnazazel* means a demon, it would seem to imply a sacrifice to that demon; but granting the sending the goat to that demon was not properly a sacrifice, or an act of religious worship, it seems, however, to have been a rite, which might so easily have been interpreted into an encouragement of demon-wor-

* Herodot. Euterp. cap. xlvi. p. 106, 107, edit. Gronov.; Maimon. Moreh Nevoch. part iii. cap. xlvi. p. 480. See various testimonies to the same purpose in Bochart. Hieroz. part i. lib. ii. cap. liii. p. 641, and part ii. lib. vi. cap. vii. p. 828. 830. Compare Lev. xvii. 7, and 2 Chron. xi. 15, in the Hebrew שעירים *sengnirim, hirci.*

ship, that it is very difficult to conceive of it as a divine institution.

Upon the whole, though we cannot arrive at absolute certainty in this matter, the first opinion appears most probable; and that, as the sacrifice-goat was typical of the expiation of sin by the sacrifice of Christ, the scape-goat, which was to have the sins of the people confessed over him, and as it were put upon him, and then to be sent away alive into some desert place, where they would see him no more, was intended to signify the effect of the expiation, namely, the removing of guilt, insomuch, that it should never more be charged on the once pardoned sinner.*

The rites attending the public service of this day were chiefly performed by the high-priest, who had more to do on this than any other day of the year, or perhaps all the rest together. He was to kill and offer the sacrifices, and sprinkle their blood with his own hands; Lev. xvi. 11—15. He was dressed, therefore, in a manner suitable to this service, with only a single linen vest and breeches, and with a linen girdle and mitre; ver. 4. These the Jews called the white garments, as distinguished from the other four, which completed the pontifical habit, wherein the high-priest ministered on other occasions, and which were styled the golden garments, because they had a mixture of gold in them; namely, the blue robe, adorned at the bottom with golden bells and pomegranates; the embroidered ephod, with its curious girdle; the breastplate, enriched with jewels set in gold; and the golden fillet or crown upon the mitre. Whenever the high-priest ministered on other occasions, he was dressed in these eight garments.† On the day of expiation he wore only the four which were common to him and the other priests. Some conceive this was designed as a token of humility, this day being appointed for the confession of sins and for repentance. There was also

* On this subject, see Frischmuthi Dissert. duæ de Hirco Emissario, apud Thesaur. Theolog. Philolog. tom. ii. p. 914, et seq.; Deylingii Observat. Sacræ, part i. observ. xviii. de Hirco Emissario Christi Figurâ; Spencer. de Hirco Emissario, apud Leg. Hebræor. lib. iii. dissert. viii.; and Bochart. Hieroz. part i. lib. ii. cap. liv.

† See these garments described in Exod. xxviii., and above, book i. chap. v. p. 144—162.

another good reason why he should on this occasion be dressed like an ordinary priest, because he was to do the work of one in killing and offering the sacrifices, which, being a laborious employment, required him to be thinly clad, and his upper garments to be laid aside. Besides, as some of it was but dirty work, performing it in these vestments, which were rich and finely embroidered, would have been altogether improper.

The grand peculiarity in the service of this day, was the high-priest entering into the holy of holies, which was not permitted at any other time; Lev. xvi. 2, &c., compared with Heb. ix. 7. And as it was his peculiar privilege thus to draw nearer to God, or to the tokens of his special presence, to the ark, to the mercy-seat, and to the shechinah, than was allowed any other mortal, Philo makes him, on this occasion, to be transformed into somewhat more than man. To which purpose he cites a passage of Leviticus in the following manner: Οταν—εισιη εις τα ἁγια των ἁγιων, *scilicet*, ὁ μεγας ἱερευς, ανθρωπος ουκ εσται εως αν εξελθη. "Quum ingressus fuerit, nempe magnus sacerdos, in sancta sanctorum, non erit homo, donec egressus fuerit."* But this conceit is built on a sad misrepresentation of the passage; for the words are these, Πας ανθρωπος ουκ εσται εν τῃ σκηνῃ, "there shall be no man in the tabernacle when he," the high-priest, "goes in to make an atonement in the holy place;" Lev. xvi. 17.

It is queried, whether on this day the high-priest entered more than once into the most holy place. It should seem, by the ritual in the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus, that he must do it three or four several times, in order to carry in, *first*, the censer full of burning coals in one hand, and the incense in the other, ver. 12; *secondly*, the blood of the bullock, which was sacrificed for himself and his house, ver. 14; *thirdly*, the blood of the goat of the sin-offering for the people, ver. 15; and it may be, *fourthly*, as the rabbies say, to bring out the censer and the pot which contained the incense. Thus, according to them, he entered into the holy of holies, on this one day, four several times;† whereas some Christian writers,

* Philonis lib. secund. de Somniis, Oper. p. 880, F, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

† Maimonides et Bartenora in Mishn. tit. Chelim. cap. i. sect. ix. tom. vi. p. 23; et Mishn. tit. Joma, cap. v. sect. i. p. 231; sect. iii. p. 234;

on the contrary, have asserted, that he entered only once; supposing it to be so declared by the apostle, when he saith, "Into the second [tabernacle] went the high-priest alone once every year;" Heb. ix. 7. Besides, they allege, that if he had entered oftener, he would have failed, in that particular, of being what the apostle represents him to be, a type of Christ,* "who entered once into the holy place;" ver. 12.

To this it is replied, that the high-priest might properly enough be said to enter in only once, that is, one day in the year, though he entered in ever so many times on that day. In like manner all the male Israelites are said to appear before the Lord, or at the national altar, three times in the year, that is, at three different seasons, or on the three grand festivals. But no one would suppose they were permitted to visit the temple no more than once at each of those festivals, especially considering that two of them lasted each for the space of a week.†

The service performed by the high-priest in the inmost sanctuary was burning incense, and sprinkling the blood of the sacrifices before the mercy-seat, which he was to do with his finger seven times; Lev. xvi. 14. The same number of sprinklings of the blood of the sin-offerings of the congregation is required on another occasion, chap. iv. 6; and likewise of the blood of the red heifer, which was burnt, in order to make the water of separation with its ashes; Numb. xix. 4. The same rite is prescribed for the cleansing of a leper, Lev. xiv. 7; in dedicating the altar, chap. viii. 11; and at the consecration of the priests, Exod. xxix. 21, compared with ver. 35. Some persons discover a great deal of mystery in this number seven, observing that it is much used on other occasions. Jericho was besieged seven days, on each of which seven priests were to blow with seven trumpets; Josh. vi. Seven

sect. iv. p. 235; cap. viii. sect. iv. p. 248, edit. Surenhus.; Maimon. de Solenni Die Expiationum, cap. iv. sect. i. p. 681, sect. ii. p. 682, 683. 686, Crenii Fascicul. Septimi.

* See Wilkens de Functione Pontificis Maxim. ad Hebr. ix. 7. dissert. ii. cap. iii. præsertim à sect. x. ad fin. capitis, p. 763—765, tom. ii. Thesauri Theologico Philolog.

† Vid. Deylingii Observat. Sacræ, part ii. observ. xiii. sect. xvi.—xxx. p. 184—198.

priests also blew with seven trumpets before the ark, when David brought it home; 1 Chron. xv. 24. Naaman is ordered by the prophet Elisha to wash himself in Jordan seven times; 2 Kings v. 10. In the book of the Revelation we read of the seven spirits of God, chap. v. 6; of the book with seven seals, ver. 1; of seven angels with trumpets, chap. viii. 2; and of seven phials full of the wrath of God; chap. xv. 7. Every seventh day was the sabbath; every seventh year was a year of rest unto the land, in which there was no ploughing or sowing; and seven times seven years brought the jubilee. Seven was also much regarded in the number of victims offered on extraordinary occasions. Job offered seven bullocks and seven rams for his friends; Job xlii. 1. David sacrificed the same number of victims on occasion of his bringing the ark to the place he had prepared for it; 1 Chron. xv. 26. Hezekiah offered victims by sevens, when he abolished idolatry, and restored the true religion; 2 Chron. xxix. 21. Nay, it appears that the number seven was highly regarded, and thought of great efficacy in religious actions, not only by the Jews, but by the heathens. Balak, king of Moab, offered, by the direction of Balaam, seven oxen and seven rams upon seven altars; Numb. xxiii. 1, 2. Apuleius saith, "Desirous of purifying myself, I wash in the sea, and dip my head seven times in the waves; the divine Pythagoras having taught, that this number is above all others most proper in the concerns of religion."*

The high-priest is ordered to sprinkle the blood eastward, Lev. xvi. 14; in the appointment of which circumstance, likewise, some have discovered a profound mystery; that whereas the priests, in all the other parts of their service, turned their faces to the west, the high-priest, in performing this chief part of his ministry, disposed his face toward the east, "as turning his back upon the beggarly elements of this world," and as representing him whose name is the East; for so the Septuagint and the Vulgate render the Hebrew word צמח *tsemach*,

* Apuleius de Asino Aureo, lib. xi. ad init. Those who would see more concerning the number seven, and its supposed mysteries, may read St. Jerome on Amos v. 3, and Philo de Opificio Mundi, Oper. p. 15—21; de Legis Allegor. lib. i. p. 31—33; de Decalogo, Oper. p. 585, 586, edit. Colon. Allobr. p. 1613.

in Zechariah vi. 12, "Behold the man whose name is," as we render it, "the Branch;" but according to the versions just mentioned, *ανατολη*, or *oriens*. However, the true reason of his sprinkling the blood eastward is evidently because the mercy-seat, before which he was to sprinkle it, stood on the east-side of the holy of holies, the side by the veil, which parted it from the sanctuary. It is said, "he shall sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat;" by which one would think he sprinkled the mercy-seat itself with some of the blood. But the Jews unanimously understand it otherwise; and indeed על-פני *gnal-penè*, which we render "upon," may as well be translated "toward;" or, as we express it, "over against the face of the mercy-seat." The difference between על-פני *gnal-penè* and לפני *lip-penè*, which we render "upon," and "before," is only this, that the former signifie stoward the top, and the latter toward the lower part of the mercy-seat.*

The rabbies represent the high-priest as washing himself all over, and changing his dress several times during the service of this day, sometimes wearing the white and sometimes the golden vestments.†

As to the spiritual or evangelical meaning of these rites, the apostle hath very particularly explained them in the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. As the high-priest was a type of Christ, his laying aside those vestments which were "made for glory and for beauty," Exod. xxviii. 2, and appearing only in his white garments, might signify our Lord's state of humiliation, when he "laid aside the glory which he had with the Father before the world was," and "was made in fashion as a man."

The expiatory sacrifices, offered by the high-priest, were typical of the true expiation which Christ made for the sins of his people by the sacrifice of himself; and the priest's confess-

* Deylingii Observat. Sacræ, part ii. observ. xiii. sect. xxvi. xxvii. p. 194, 195.

† Vid. Reland. Antiq. part iv. cap. vi.; Mishn. tit. Joma, cap. iii. sect. iii.—vii. p. 218—221; cap. iv. sect. v. p. 230; cap. viii. sect. iii. iv. p. 247, 248, tom. ii. Surenhus.; Maimon. de Solenni Die Expiationum, cap. ii. sect. i.—vi. p. 658—662; cap. iv. sect. i. p. 678; sect. ii. p. 685, 686, Crenii Fascic. Septimi.

ing the sins of the people over, and putting them upon the head of the scape-goat, Lev. xvi. 21, was a lively emblem of the imputation of sin to Christ, "who was made sin for us," 2 Cor. v. 21; for "the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all;" Isa. liii. 6. And the goat's "bearing upon him all the iniquities of the Jews into a land not inhabited," Lev. xvi. 22, signifies the effect of Christ's sacrifice in delivering his people from guilt and punishment. The priest's entering into the holy of holies, with the blood of the sacrifice, is interpreted by the apostle to be typical of Christ's ascension and heavenly intercession for his people, in virtue of the sacrifice of his death.*

† For a more particular account of the spiritual design of the rites attending the service of the day of expiation, see Witsius de Œconom. Fœderum, lib. iv. cap. vi. sect. lviii. Concerning the day of expiation, see the commentators on the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus, particularly Ainsworth, Lightfoot's Temple Service, and the Mishnical tract Joma, with Sheringham's notes.

CHAPTER IX.

OF THE SABBATICAL YEAR, OR SEVENTH YEAR'S REST.

Among the πτωχα στοιχεια, or beggarly elements of the Jewish dispensation, the apostle mentions days, and months, and times, and years, Gal. iv. 9, 10. For besides the weekly sabbath, or days of rest, the law prescribed the observance of the monthly new moons, and annual festival seasons, such as the passover, pentecost, feast of tabernacles, &c., which are the καιροι, or times, to which the apostle refers; and likewise whole years, to be observed with peculiar regard after certain returning periods, such as every seventh year, called the sabbatical year: and every seven times seventh, styled the jubilee.

It is the former which falls under our present consideration;* and in the law of Moses it is distinguished from all others by several names. It is sometimes called שנה השבעית *shanah hashebingnith*, the seventh year, κατ' εξοχην; sometimes שבת הארץ *sabbath haarets*, the sabbath, or rest of the land; and sometimes שמטה ליהוה *shemittah Laihovah*, the release of the Lord.

The peculiar observances of this year were the four following:

1st. A total cessation from all manner of agriculture.

2dly. Leaving all the spontaneous product of the ground to be used and enjoyed in common; so that no person was to claim any peculiar property.

3dly. The remission of all debts from one Israelite to another.

4thly. The public reading of the law at the feast of tabernacles.

* The institution of the sabbatical year is in Exod. xxiii. 10, 11; Lev. xxv. 2—7; Deut. xv. 1—18; and xxxi. 10—13.

Before we consider these several particulars, there are two chronological questions to be briefly discussed:

1st. From whence the computation of the sabbatical year commenced; and,

2dly. At what season of the year it began.

1st. It is made a question, from whence the computation of the sabbatical year commenced, or how soon it began to be observed by the Jews. In the general, it was when they came into the land of Canaan. For they received this command, while they were yet in the wilderness, "When ye come into the land which I give you, then shall the land keep a sabbath to the Lord;" Lev. xxv. 2. Nevertheless, it is far from being settled what year after their entrance into Canaan was observed as their first sabbatical year. Archbishop Usher* determines it to be the seventh year after the manna ceased, from which time the Israelites lived upon the fruits of the land of Canaan, Josh. v. 12; and six years being taken up in the conquest and division of the land, the seventh proved in all respects a year of rest, when they peaceably enjoyed the fruits of their victories, and of the country they had subdued.

Nevertheless, others observing that the sabbatical year is enjoined to be observed after six years of agriculture,—"Six years thou shalt sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vineyard, and gather in the fruit thereof; but in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land," Lev. xxv. 3, 4; I say others for this reason conceive it more probable, that the six years preceding the sabbatical year did not commence till after the conquest and division of the land. For it is not to be supposed, that they could apply themselves to agriculture till they had actually conquered it, or that they would do it till each man's property was assigned him. Now the year in which Joshua divided the land may be thus computed: Caleb was forty years old when Moses sent him from Kadesh-barnea to spy out the land, Josh. xiv. 7; and this was in the autumn of the second year from their *exodos*, or at the season when the grapes, pomegranates, and figs were ripe, of which the spies brought a sample with them; Numb. xiii. 23. But Caleb was eighty-five years old at the time of the division of the land, Josh. xiv. 10; it was, therefore, forty-five years

* Usser. Annales, A. M. 2554.

since he went as a spy; to which adding one year and a half before elapsed between that time and the *exodos*, and the division of the land will appear to have been made in the forty-seventh year of their departure from Egypt; from which subtracting forty years, the time of their wandering in the wilderness, Numb. xiv. 33, 34, and there remain six years and an half from their entrance into Canaan to the division of the land, which was completed the latter end of the summer; insomuch that every man's property was assigned him against the ensuing seed time, with which began the six years that preceded the first sabbatical year. Probably, therefore, the first sabbatical year was not kept till the fourteenth year from their entrance into Canaan.*

2dly. The other chronological question is, at what season the sabbatical year began, whether with the month Nisan in the spring, or Tisri in autumn; or, in other words, whether the sabbatical year was reckoned by the ecclesiastic or civil computation.

This question, though not expressly determined by the Mosaic law, is, I apprehend, not very difficult to be decided. That the sabbatical year followed the civil computation, beginning with the month Tisri, may be strongly inferred from a passage in the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus, ver. 3, 4, where they are commanded to "sow their fields and prune their vineyards, and gather the fruit thereof, for six years successively, and to let the land rest," or lie fallow, "on the seventh." Doubtless, therefore, the seventh, or sabbatical year, began after the harvest and fruits were gathered in, and against the usual season of ploughing and sowing. It must then have begun in autumn;† for had it begun with the month Nisan, they must have lost a crop of the last year's sowing, as well as have neglected the seed time for the next year; which is inconsistent with the law in the twenty-third of Exodus, ver. 10, "Six years shalt thou sow thy land, and gather in the fruits thereof."

We proceed to consider the particular observances of the sabbatical year. The

First is, The total cessation from all manner of agriculture:

* Maimon. de Anno Sabbatico et Jubilæo, cap. x. sect. ii.

† Mishn. Rosh Hashanah, cap. i. sect. i. p. 300, tom. ii.

"Thou shalt neither sow thy field, nor prune thy vineyard;" Lev. xxv. 4. If it be asked, what they were to live upon during this year, the answer is,

1st. They were allowed to eat whatever the land and fruit-trees produced spontaneously, without ploughing and pruning; only the proprietors of the ground and trees were not to look upon the product of that year as peculiarly their own, but all was to be in common; as will be showed under another head. Now some crop would rise this year from the corn shed in the last harvest, and from what was scattered in winnowing, which they performed abroad in the fields. But,

2dly. The question is best answered by God himself: "I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring forth fruit for three years," ver. 21: that is, for part of the sixth, the whole seventh, and part of the eighth, till harvest come, reckoning the years to begin with Nisan. Thus one whole year and part of two others were called three years; as one whole day and part of two others, during which our Saviour laid in the sepulchre, are termed three days and three nights, Matt. xii. 40, *τρεις ἡμερας και τρεις νυκτας*, which is a Hebraism of the same import with the Greek word *νυκθημερα*, or three natural days.*

This divine promise of an extraordinary blessing on the sixth year is doubtless to be understood conditionally, on supposition of their obedience to the law of God. When therefore they became neglectful on this head, and frequently revolted to idolatry, it is reasonable to suppose God, in a great measure at least, withheld that extraordinary blessing. Whereupon, as one sin frequently leads to another, they also frequently neglected the observance of the sabbatical year. And on that account, as Mr. Mede observes, the Lord, agreeably to what he had foretold and threatened (Lev. xxvi. 34, compared with 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21), caused them to be carried captive, and the land to be waste for seventy years, without inhabitant, till it had fulfilled the years of sabbath which they observed not. For their idolatry he gave them into the hand of their enemies, the Gentiles; and moreover, for their sab-

* See Reland. Antiq. part iv. cap. i. sect. xx. xxi. p. 442—444, 3d edit.; Kidder's Demonstration of the Messias, part i. chap. viii. p. 104; part ii. chap. iii. p. 61—64, 2d edit. fol. London, 1726.

batical sacrilege, he caused them not only to be made captives, but carried away into a strange country, and their land lay desolate for seventy years.* This making profit of their land on the sabbatical year, as well as not remitting debts upon that year, as the law enjoined them, was "the iniquity of their covetousness, for which the Lord was wroth with them, and smote them;" Isa. lvii. 17. Indeed, after they had been thus chastised for their disobedience, they grew superstitiously scrupulous, rather than religiously obedient, in observing the sabbatical year. Nevertheless, it does not appear God ever renewed the extraordinary blessing on the sixth year, which he first promised them, and they had shamefully forfeited. So that in after-ages the sabbatical year was always a year of scarcity. Hence, when Alexander the Great, by a wonderful providence, was diverted from his purpose of destroying Jerusalem, and, on the contrary, became most kindly disposed toward the Jews, bidding them ask what they had to desire of him; they petitioned for an exemption every seventh year from paying tribute, because, according to their law, they then neither sowed nor reaped.† Hence also our Saviour, forewarning his disciples of the approaching calamities of Jerusalem and Judea, whereby they would be obliged to quit their habitations and their country, advises them to pray that their flight might not be in the winter, nor εν σαββατω, Matt. xxiv. 20, which is most naturally to be understood of the sabbatical year; when provisions being scarce, would make it doubly inconvenient to be forced to travel and sojourn among strangers.

Secondly, Another observance, belonging to the sabbatical year, was leaving the spontaneous product of the fields and fruit-trees to be used and enjoyed in common; so that no persons were to claim any peculiar property in them. For, although the product of this year was to be for the poor and the beast of the field, Exod. xxiii. 11, yet the proprietors of the fields and vineyards were not excluded from sharing it in common with others; as appears from the following passage: "The sabbath of the land shall be meat for you, for thee and

* Mede's Diatrib. discourse xxvii. p. 123, of his Works.

† Joseph. Antiq. lib. xi. cap. viii.; or Prideaux's Connect. part i. book vii. sub A, ante Christ. 332.

for thy servant," Lev. xxv. 6, 7: where the word sabbath means the fruit that grew on the sabbatical year; as elsewhere, chap. xxiii. 38, the sabbaths of the Lord signify the sacrifices offered on the sabbath days.

On this year, therefore, the whole land was one common field, in which none were considered as having any distinct property, but every rich and poor Israelite and foreigner who happened to be in the country, nay, men and beasts, were fellow-commoners. So that, as Maimonides saith, whoever locked up his vineyard or hedged in his field on the seventh year, broke a commandment; and so likewise, if he gathered in all his fruits into his house. On the contrary, all was to be free, and every man's hand alike in all places.*

Since beasts are mentioned in the law as fellow-commoners with men, the Jews, according to Maimonides, were over-careful, that they should have an equal share with themselves. So that when there was no longer any fruit for the beasts of the field, they would not eat of what they had gathered for themselves, but threw it out of their houses.†

Thirdly, The next observance, attending the sabbatical year, was the remission of all debts from one Israelite to another; Deut. xv. 1—3. The rabbies have devised such a number of exceptions to this law, as in a manner wholly to defeat it. They say, for instance, he that lends upon a pawn, is not bound to release; that mulcts, or fines for defaming a man, &c., are not to be released; that if a man was cast at law in a certain sum to be paid to another, it was not to be released; and that if a man lent money on the express condition that the debt should not be released on the sabbatical year, he was not bound to release it.‡

Some of them will have the release to signify no more than that the debt should not be claimed in that year; but that after the expiration of it, it might be demanded.§ Thus they make void the commandment of God by their traditions; for the law seems plainly to require an absolute discharge of all debts

* Maimon. de Anno Sabbatic. et Jubilæo, cap. iv. sect. xxiv.

† Maimon. ubi supra, cap. vii.

‡ Mishn. tit. Shebingnith, cap. x. præsertim, sect. ii.—iv. p. 195, 196, tom. i.

§ Maimon. de Anno Sabbat. cap. ix.

from one Israelite to another, though it did not extend to debts owing them by foreigners or heathens. The only point in this law, which can well bear dispute, is, at what time the discharge was to be given to the debtor, whether at the beginning or at the end of the year. Maimonides* understands, that it was not to be given till the end; because it is said, "At the end of every seventh year ye shall make a release;" Deut. xv. 1. Others conceive, I apprehend on juster grounds, that the release took place at the beginning, or that the debtor was freed from his obligation as soon as the sabbatical year commenced. For in a parallel case, the release of a Hebrew servant, we find this phrase, "at the end of seven years," means in the seventh year, as soon as the six years' service was completed; see Deut. xv. 12. 18; compared with Jer. xxxiv. 14: "At the end of seven years let ye go every man his brother, an Hebrew, which hath been sold unto thee; and when he hath served thee six years, thou shalt let him go free from thee."

The whole seventh year, then, is called the end of the seven years, as being the last of the week of years; in like manner as we call the whole Saturday the end of the week.

Some also refer to the sabbatical year the release of the Hebrew servants, or slaves; who had liberty to go out free on the seventh year. But in that case, the seventh year seems rather to mean the seventh from the beginning of their servitude;† because it is said, "If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve you, and in the seventh year he shall go free;" Exod. xxi. 2. Again, "When he has served thee six years, then shalt thou let him go free from thee;" Jer. xxxiv. 14.

The year of manumission could not therefore be the sabbatical year, unless the servitude commenced immediately after the last sabbatical year. Although, therefore, the mention of the release of Hebrew servants may seem to be introduced in this place a little out of its proper course, we shall notwithstanding take this opportunity briefly to comment upon the law concerning them in the twenty-first chapter of Exodus, ver. 1—6. I would especially remark, that in case such a

* Maimon. de Anno Sabbatic. et Jubilæo, cap. ix. sect. iv.

† Maimon. de Servis, cap. ii. sect. ii. iii.

servant, or slave, should voluntarily renounce his proffered liberty, and choose to abide with his old master, he was to be brought before the judges, that it might appear he was not forcibly or fraudulently detained against the law, but staid with his own consent, ver. 5, 6. Upon which his ear was to be bored with an awl to the door-post of his master's house, in token that he was now affixed to his house and service for life, or at least till the year of the jubilee. This Jewish custom was borrowed by other nations; particularly by the Arabians; as appears from a passage of Petronius Arbiter,* where he introduces one Giton expressing himself in these terms: "Circumcide nos, ut Judæi videamur; et pertunde aures, ut imitemur Arabes." Juvenal puts the following expressions in the mouth of a Libertinus:

> ——————————— Quamvis
> Natus ad Euphratem, molles quod in aure fenestræ
> Arguerint, licet ipse negem.
>
> Satyr. i. l. 104.

It is generally supposed by the commentators, that the Psalmist refers to this rite in the fourth Psalm: "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened," ver. 6: "Or," as the margin translates the verb כרית *caritha*, "my ears hast thou digged." But the apostle, quoting this passage, which he applies to Christ, renders it σωμα δε κατηρτισω μοι, "a body hast thou prepared me," Heb. x. 5: which is a quotation of the apostle's from the Septuagint, though it manifestly differs from the Hebrew text; and great use hath accordingly been made of it, to prove the authority of that version. It cannot, however, be easily imagined he would follow the Septuagint in preference to the Hebrew original, when he was writing to those who were Hebrews, and would probably object against such a citation. The commentators have endeavoured to show, that the quotation is made κατα διανοιαν, though not κατα λεξιν; according to the sense, though not according to the letter.†

The learned Mr. Pierce observes, that the authority of the Septuagint, and of an inspired apostle, should weigh more

* Petron. Arbitri Satyricon, p. 364, edit. Michael. Hadrian. Amstel. 1669.

† See Whitby, Pool, &c. in loc.

with us than that of our present Hebrew copies, which may have been corrupted through the mistake of transcribers, and that in this case the Hebrew should be corrected by the Greek. He conjectures, therefore, that the word אזנים *osnaim, aures,* was in the true copy אז-גוף *as-guph, tunc corpus.* We have other instances of the like mistakes of joining two words in one. In the fifteenth verse of the third chapter of Isaiah, מה לכם *mah lachem, quid vobis,* as it is in the keri, is made one word in the chetibh, מלכם *mallachem,* which signifies their king; but in that place it carries no sense at all. As for the change of גוף *guph* into נים *naim,* it is not very improbable, considering the similitude of the ג *gimel* and נ *nun,* the י *jod* and ו *vau,* and the ף *phe* final, and ם *mem* final; for if the long stroke of the ף *phe,* below the line, was obscure, it might easily be mistaken for *mem clausum.*

Indeed the word גוף *guph* is not found in the Hebrew Bible; but we have גופה *guphah,* the feminine; and גוף *guph* is frequently used by the rabbies. Perhaps, therefore, it might be an απαξ λεγομενον in the clause under consideration. However, if that be disliked, we need only read גוה *gevah,* which the Seventy elsewhere render σωμα; see Job xx. 25. As for the verb כרה *charah,* Stockius shows its proper meaning is *paravit.** So that, according to this conjectural criticism, the clause is literally rendered, by the Septuagint and by the apostle, σωμα κατηρτισω μοι, "a body hast thou prepared me."

Dr. Doddridge† brings another solution of the words from Monsieur Saurin, who supposes that the Septuagint chose to explain the phrase of boring the ear by that of preparing the body for service; as better known to those for whom the version was intended; and therefore to be preferred also by the apostle, who, though he directs this epistle to the Hebrews, to whom the other custom might be well known, yet intended it for general use.‡

We return to the sabbatical year. The

Fourth observance, which we mentioned, was the public reading of the law at the close of it at the feast of tabernacles, Deut. xxxi. 10, 11. As men's minds were now free from

* See Stockii Clavis Vet. Test. in verb.

† Doddridge in loc.

‡ Saurin's Serm. vol. xi. p. 17—23.

cares by the release of their debts, it might be supposed they would the better attend to God's law. This, therefore, was a proper opportunity for the public reading it to the people.

As for the general reason, on which the law concerning the sabbatical year was grounded, it was, no doubt, partly political and civil, to prevent the land being worn out by continual tilling;* partly religious, to afford the poor and labouring people more leisure one year in seven, to attend to devotional exercises; and partly mystical, typifying that spiritual rest, which Christ will give to all who come unto him; Matt. xi. 28. Some, both Jews and Christians, make the sabbatical year to be typical of the Millennium. For as the law consecrates the seventh day and the seventh year, they conclude the world will last six thousand years in the state in which we now see it; or, as R. Elias in the Talmud expresses it, two thousand years without the law, two thousand under the law, and two thousand under the Messiah.† After which comes the grand sabbath of one thousand years. This notion, though it be perhaps without any sufficient ground, might be improved into an argument *ad hominem,* to convince the Jews that the Messiah must be already come; since the world is gone far more than half way through the last two thousand years of the six thousand, allowed by their tradition for its continuance; during which period, therefore, if at all, must be the reign of the Messiah.‡

* Maimon. Moreh Nevoch. part iii. cap. xxxix.; Philo de Execrationibus, Oper. p. 724, B, C, edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

† Vid. Cocceii, Sanhedrim et Maccoth, apud excerpt. Gemar. Sanhedr. cap. xi. sect. xxix. p. 346, edit. Amstel. 1629.

‡ See on this subject the Commentators on Deut. xv., particularly Ainsworth; see also Reland. Antiq. Hebr. part. iv. cap. viii. sect. xiii.—xvii.

CHAPTER X.

THE JUBILEE.

THE jubilee was the grand sabbatical year, celebrated after every seven septenaries of years; namely, every forty-ninth or fiftieth year. This was a year of general release, not only of all debts, like the common sabbatical year, but of all slaves; and of all lands and possessions which had been sold, or otherwise alienated from the families and tribes to which they originally belonged.*

The critics are not agreed about the etymology of the word יובל *Jobel*. Some derive it from Jubal, who was the inventor of musical instruments, Gen. iv. 21; and suppose, that this year was named after him, because it is a year of mirth and joy, on which music is a common attendant; or, as we say in English, a jovial time, the word jovial being perhaps a corruption of the Hebrew word Jobel; or else, because it was ushered in with the musical sound of the trumpet through the whole land.† Others, particularly R. David Kimchi, tell us, that Jobel signifies a ram in the Arabic; and that this year was so called, because it was proclaimed with trumpets made of rams' horns.‡ With him the rabbies in general agree.§ Bochart, however, is of opinion, there were never any trumpets made of rams' horns, they being very unsuitable for such a purpose, and that the phrase שופרות היבלים *shopheroth hajjobhelim*, which, in the sixth chapter of Joshua, ver. 4, we render trumpets of rams' horns, means only such trumpets

* See the institution of this festival, in Lev. xxv. 8—17.

† See Mafius ad Josh. vi. 4, apud Criticos Sacros.

‡ R. D. Kimch. in Lev. xxv.

§ R. S. Jarchi in Lev. xxv.; and the Chaldee Paraphrast sometimes explains יובל *Jobel* by דיכרא *dichra*, a ram, particularly in Josh. vi. 4.

as were to be used in proclaiming the jubilee; which, it is far more probable, were made of the horns of oxen than of rams.*

Hottinger is of opinion,† that Jobel is a word invented to imitate the sound of the instrument, and that it does not therefore signify the trumpet itself, but the sound it made.‡ Dr. Patrick espouses this etymology, and conceives this year was called Jobel from the sound then everywhere made; as the feast of the passover was styled Pesach, from the angel's passing over the Israelites when he slew the Egyptians.§

There is another opinion, which bids as fair for probability as any of the former, that Jobel comes from יבל *jabal*, in *hiphil*, הביל *hobil*, which signifies to recall, restore, bring back, &c., because this year restored all slaves to their liberty, and brought back all alienated estates to the families to which they originally belonged.‖ Accordingly the Septuagint renders Jobel, *αφεσις*, a remission, Lev. xxv. 10; and Josephus saith it signifies *ελευθεριαν*, liberty.¶

As the learned are not agreed about the etymology of the name, so neither about the year in which the festival was to be celebrated; whether every forty-ninth, or every fiftieth; and it is hard to say, which of these opinions hath the most eminent, or the most numerous advocates. On the former side are Joseph Scaliger,** Petavius,†† Jacobus Capellus,‡‡

* Bochart. Hierozoic. part. i. lib. ii. cap. xliii. Oper. tom. ii. p. 425, 426.

† Joh. Hen. Hottinger. Analect. Historico-Theolog. dissert. iii.; et Joh. Hen. Hottinger. jun. Annot. in Godwin.

‡ See Exod. xix. 13, and other places.

§ Patrick on Lev. xxv. 10.

‖ Fuller. Miscell. Sacr. lib. iv. cap. viii. apud Criticos Sacros, tom. ix.

¶ Joseph. Antiq. lib. iii. cap. xii. sect. iii. p. 184.

** Scaliger de Emendat. Tempor. lib. vii. p. 782, D, Colon. Allobr. 1629; Canon. Isagog. lib. i. p. 55, ad calcem Thesaur. Tempor. Amstel. 1658; et Animadvers. in Chronic. Eusebii, p. 15.

†† Petav. Rationar. Tempor. part. ii. lib. ii. cap. vii. p. 87, et seq. edit. Paris, 1673; et de Doctrin. Tempor. lib. ix. cap. xxvii.

‡‡ Jacob. Capell. Histor. Sacr. et Exotic. ad A. M. 2549.

Cunæus,* Spanheim,† Usher,‡ Le Clerc§, and many others; on the latter, the Jews in general,‖ many of the Christian fathers, and among the moderns, Fagius,¶ Junius,** Hottinger,†† Schindler,‡‡ Leidekker,§§ Leusden,|||| Meyer,¶¶ Calmet,[*] &c.

The ground of the former opinion is chiefly this, that the forty-ninth year being of course a sabbatical year, if the jubilee had been kept on the fiftieth, the land must have had two sabbaths, or must have lain fallow two years together, since all agriculture was forbid on the jubilee, as well as on the sabbatical year.

Now this is thought an unreasonable supposition, since in all likelihood, without a miracle, it must have produced a dearth. If the law, therefore, had carried any such intention, one might have expected a special promise, that the forty-eighth year should bring forth fruit for four years, as there was, that the sixth year should bring forth fruit for three.

On the other hand it is alleged, that the Scripture declares for the fiftieth year, Lev. xxv. 10, 11: "And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land

* Cunæus de Republ. Hebr. lib. i. cap. vi. p. 54, et seq.

† Spanheim. Chronolog. Sacra, part. i. cap. xvi. p. 84—86, apud Oper. Geograph. Chronolog. et Histor. Lugd. Bat. 1701.

‡ Usser. Annal. A. M. 2609 Jubilæus Primus; A. M. 2658 Jubilæus Secundus, see p. 24; A. M. 2707 Jubilæus Tertius, p. 25, edit. Genev. 1722.

§ Cleric. in Lev. xxv. 10.

‖ See Chaldee Paraphrast on Lev. xxv.; Maimon. de Anno Sabbatico et Jubileo, cap. x. sect. vii.; R. Menachem in Lev. xxv.

¶ Fagius in Lev. xxv. 10. ** Junius et Tremellius in loc.

†† Hottinger. Annot. in Godwin. lib. iii. cap. x. sect. xi. annot. i. p. 635, 636.

‡‡ Schindler. Lexic. Pentaglot. in verb יובל.

§§ Leidekker. de Republ. Hebræor. lib. v. cap. xiv. sect. iv. p. 323, Amstel. 1704.

|||| Leusden. Philolog. Hebræo-mixt. dissert. xli. p. 290, edit. Ultrajecti, 1682.

¶¶ Meyer. de Tempor. et Fest. Hebræor. part. ii. cap. xviii. sect. vii.—xlix. p. 343—358, 2d edit. Amstel. 1724, where he considers the argument at large.

[*] Calmet on the word Jubilee.

unto all the inhabitants thereof; it shall be a jubilee unto you, and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family; a jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you." Besides, if the law had meant, that the forty-ninth should be the jubilee, there would have been no need of forbidding sowing, reaping, &c., on the jubilee, because, that being the sabbatical year, it was forbidden in the preceding law relating to that year; Lev. xxv. 4, 5.

As to the supposed dearth, the gentlemen on this side of the question conceive, there could be no danger of that while God protected the nation by a special providence; and especially since we have an instance of their living without any harvest for two years together, when the Assyrians had trodden down or spoiled the crop of one year, and the next was probably a sabbatical year; and yet there was no famine, but they had sufficient to eat of that which grew of itself; 2 Kings xix. 29.

The authors of the Universal History have endeavoured to reconcile these two opinions; observing, that as the jubilee began on the first month of the civil year, which was the seventh of the ecclesiastical, it might be said to be either the forty-ninth or fiftieth, according as the one or the other of these different computations was followed.*

The jubilee began on the tenth day of the month Tizri, at the evening of the day of atonement; Lev. xxv. 9. A time, saith Dr. Patrick, very fitly chosen; for they would be better disposed to forgive their brethren their debts, when they had been craving pardon of God for their own. To which we may add, that when their peace was made with God by the sacrifices of atonement, it was the proper time to proclaim liberty and joy throughout the land.

The peculiar observances of the jubilee, beyond those of the common sabbatical year, were the following:—

1st. That it was proclaimed by the sound of the trumpet throughout the whole land. Maimonides saith, every private man was to blow with a trumpet, and make a sound nine times.†

* Universal History, Hist. of the Jews, book ii. chap. vii., Laws relating to the Jubilee, note R.

† Maimon. de Anno Sabbat. et Jubilæo, cap. x.

2dly. The jubilee was a year of general release of all slaves and prisoners. Even such as had voluntarily relinquished their freedom, at the end of their six years' service, and had had their ears bored in token of perpetual servitude, were yet set free at the jubilee; for "then they were to proclaim liberty throughout all the land to all the inhabitants thereof;" Lev. xxv. 10.

3dly. In this year all estates which had been sold, were returned back to their former proprietors, or to the families to which they originally belonged; by which means it was provided, that no family should be sunk and ruined, and doomed to perpetual poverty; for the family estate could not be alienated for longer than fifty years. The nearer, therefore, the jubilee was, the less was the value of the purchase of an estate, ver. 15. This law of the Jews was famous among the Heathens, some of whom copied after it. Diodorus Siculus saith, it was not lawful for the Jews, τους ιδιους κληρους πωλειν, to sell their own inheritances;* and Aristotle, in his Politics,† saith of the Locrians, that they were prohibited by their laws from selling their ancient possessions.

The reason and design of the law of the jubilee was partly political and partly typical.

1st. It was political, to prevent the too great oppression of the poor, as well as their being liable to perpetual slavery. By this means the rich were prevented from accumulating lands upon lands, and a kind of equality was preserved through all their families. Never was there any people so effectually secured of their liberty and property, as the Israelites were; God not only engaging so to protect those invaluable blessings by his providence, that they should not be taken away from them by others; but providing in a particular manner, by this law, that they should not be thrown away through their own folly; since the property, which every man or family had in their dividend of the land of Canaan, could not be sold or any way alienated for above half a century. By this means also the distinction of tribes was preserved, in respect both to their families and possessions; for this law rendered it ne-

* Diod. Sicul. lib. xl. eclog. prim. p. 922, edit. Hanov. 1604.

† Arist. Politic. lib. ii. cap. vii.; see also lib. vi. cap. iv.

cessary for them to keep genealogies of their families, that they might be able, when there was occasion, on the jubilee year, to prove their right to the inheritance of their ancestors. By this means it was certainly known, of what tribe and family the Messias sprung. Upon which Dr. Allix observes, that God did not suffer them to continue in captivity out of their own land for the space of two jubilees, lest by that means their genealogies should be lost or confounded.

A farther civil use of the jubilee might be for the readier computation of time. For, as the Greeks computed by olympiads, the Romans by lustra, and we by centuries, the Jews probably reckoned by jubilees; and it might, I say, be one design of this institution to mark out these large portions of time for the readier computation of successive years of ages.

2dly. There was also a typical design and use of the jubilee, which is pointed out by the prophet Isaiah, when he saith, in reference to the Messiah, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hat hsent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord," chap. lxi. 1, 2; where "the acceptable year of the Lord," when "liberty was proclaimed to the captives," and "the opening the prison to them that were bound," evidently refers to the jubilee; but, in the prophetic sense, means the gospel state and dispensation, which proclaims spiritual liberty from the bondage of sin and Satan, and the liberty of returning to our own possession, even the heavenly inheritance, to which, having incurred a forfeiture by sin, we had lost all right and claim.

I have only farther to observe, that this jubilee of the Jews hath been in some sort imitated by the Pope; who, after a certain returning period, proclaims a jubilee, in which he grants a plenary indulgence to all sinners, at least to as many as visit the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome.

The jubilee was first established by Pope Boniface VIII., anno 1300, and was only to return every hundredth year; but the first celebration brought such stores of wealth to Rome, that Clement VI. reduced the period to fifty years; afterward

Urban VI. appointed the jubilee to be held every thirty-five years; and Sextus IV. brought it down to twenty-five.*

One of our kings, Edward III., caused his birth-day, when he was fifty years of age, but neither before nor after, to be observed in the manner of a jubilee; this he did by releasing prisoners, pardoning all offences, treason itself not excepted, and granting many privileges to the people.†

* See on this subject, Dieteric. Antiq. Biblicæ, ex Lev. xxv. 4, p. 220, et seq. edit. Gissæ et Francof. 1671.

† Polydor. Virgil. Histor. Anglican. lib. xix. p. 494, Lugd. Bat. 1651.

CHAPTER XI.

THE FEASTS OF PURIM AND OF DEDICATION.

Besides the sacred festivals already considered, no other were appointed by the law of Moses. However, the Jews, in process of time, added several others: two of which are to be the subject of this chapter; namely, the feast of purim, of the occasion and institution of which we have an account in the book of Esther, chap. ix. 20—ult.; and the feast of dedication, mentioned by the evangelist John, chap. x. 22. They were both of them annual festivals, and observed in commemoration of national mercies and deliverances.

The former, the feast of purim, was instituted by Mordecai, to commemorate the deliverance of the Jews from Haman's conspiracy, of which we have an account in the book of Esther. Many suppose, that in this he had a special direction from God, delivered by some prophet, perhaps Haggai, or Malachi. But if so, it is strange that the sanction of divine authority should not be expressly stamped on the institution, and that the name of God should not be mentioned so much as once in the history of it, or of the events relating to it. Thus much is certain, it hath had the effect, which mere human institutions in matters of religion very commonly have, to occasion corruption and licentiousness of manners, rather than to promote piety and virtue. Though still celebrated by the Jews with great ceremony, it is a time of general riot and debauchery; and they make it a sort of rule of their religion to drink till they can no longer distinguish between the blessing of Mordecai and the cursing of Haman.* Insomuch

* Talmud cod. Megillah, fol. 7. 2, quoted by Buxtorf. Synag. Judaic. cap. xxix. p. 559, 3d edit. in Lexic. Talmud. sub voc. בכם, p. 324; and by Leusden. Philolog. Hebræo-mixt. dissert. xl. p. 285, 2d edit. Ultraject. 1682.

that Archbishop Usher very justly styles the feast of purim the Bacchanalia of the Jews.*

This festival was to be kept two days successively, the fourteenth and fifteenth of the month Adar; Esth. ix. 21. In the intercalatory year, therefore, when there are two Adars, it is kept twice over;† the first time with less ceremony, which they call the little purim; the second, in the Veadar, with more ceremony, which they term the great purim.‡ On both days of the feast the modern Jews read over the Megillah, or book of Esther, in their synagogues. The copy there read must not be printed, but written on vellum in the form of a roll; and the names of the ten sons of Haman are written in it in a peculiar manner, being ranged, they say, like so many bodies hanging on a gibbet. The reader must pronounce all these names in one breath. Whenever Haman's name is pronounced, they make a terrible noise in the synagogue; some drum with their feet on the floor, and the boys have mallets, with which to knock and make a noise.§ They prepare themselves for their carnival by a previous fast, which should continue three days, in imitation of Esther's (chap. iv. 16); but, for the generality, they have reduced it to one day.‖

We may here take occasion to consider three questions, started upon the story to which this festival relates.

1st. When, and in whose reign, the affair happened, which it is intended to commemorate.

2dly. For what reason Mordecai refused to pay that respect to Haman, the neglect of which so much incensed him against the Jews.

3dly. Why Haman cast lots, in order to fix the day for the massacre of the Jews.

First. The first question is, when, and in what king's reign, this affair happened. Though it was doubtless after the kingdom of Judah returned from its captivity, yet the ten tribes still continued in their dispersion, from which they have not

* Usser. Annales, sub A. M. 3495, p. 88, edit. Genev. 1722.

† Mishn. tit. Megillah, cap. i. sect. iv. tom. ii. p. 389.

‡ Buxtorf. Synag. lib. xxix. sub fin.

§ Buxtorf. Synag. Judaic. cap. xxix. p. 555—558.

‖ Hottinger in Godwin. lib. iii. cap. xi. annot. i. p. 643.

been recovered to this day. Accordingly the Jews are said, at that time, to have been dispersed through all the provinces of Ahasuerus's kingdom, "who reigned from India even to Ethiopia, over one hundred twenty and seven provinces;" Esth. i. 1; iii. 8. But who this Ahasuerus was, is a question upon which chronologers are much divided. Usher* takes him to be Darius the son of Hystaspes, who promoted the building of the temple at Jerusalem; Ezra vi. Scaliger thinks it was Xerxes, who was Darius's successor.† J. Capellus‡ is persuaded this Ahasuerus was Ochus, one of the last kings of Persia; for in his reign Alexander the Great was born, who brought the Persian empire to its period. Dr. Patrick, in support of this opinion, observes, that Ochus's Persian name was Achash, to which Verosh being added as his sirname, he was called by the Persians Achas-verosh, which the Greeks translated Ahasuerus.§ Rollin‖ supposes him to have been Cambyses. I take the opinion of Prideaux¶ to be the most probable of any, that Ahasuerus was Artaxerxes Longimanus; through whose favour to the Jews Ezra and Nehemiah completed the restoration of the kingdom of Judah, and rebuilt Jerusalem. It is likely his extraordinary kindness to that people was owing to the influence of his queen Esther: it is particularly remarked, that when Nehemiah obtained his commission to rebuild and fortify Jerusalem, the queen was sitting by; Nehem. ii. 6.

As for the name אחש-ורוש *Achash-verosh*, it seems rather to have been a title common to the kings of Media and Persia, than a proper name of any of them. It is evidently compounded of the Persic word אחש *achash, dignitas,* which the rabbies commonly use for *magnus*, and ראש *rosh, caput, summitas, dux, princeps.*** So that *Achash-verosh* signifies

* Usser. Annal. A. M. 3483, p. 85.

† Scalig. de Emendat. Tempor. p. 585, et seq. præsertim, p. 591—593.

‡ Histor. Sacr. et Exotic. A. M. 3640 et 3650.

§ Patrick on Esth. i. 1.

‖ Rollin's Ancient History, vol. ii. book iv. chap. ii.

¶ Prideaux's Connect. part. i. book iv. sub anno ante Christ. 465, p. 361—364, vol. i. 10th edit.; see also Clerici Annot. in Esth. i. 1.

** Vid. Pfeifferi Exercitationes ad calcem Dubior. Vexator. exercitat. iii. de Linguâ Protoplast. p. 67, 3d edit. Lipsiæ.

magnum caput, sive magnus princeps; and was, as some think, *nomen gentilitium*, the name of all their kings, as Pharaoh was of all the kings of Egypt. Accordingly this name or title is also given, as is commonly thought, to Cambyses, in the fourth chapter of Ezra, ver. 6. Nevertheless, it might be given to Artaxerxes, κατ' εξοχην. The

Second question is, for what reason Mordecai refused to pay that respect to Haman, the neglect of which so much incensed him against the Jews; Esth. iii. 1—6.

This question can be only answered conjecturally. Some think the reason was, because Haman was an Amalekite; and the Israelites had been commissioned from God to destroy that whole nation, because of the injuries they had formerly done them; Deut. xxv. 17—19. But this hardly seems to be a sufficient account of Mordecai's refusing civil respect to Haman, who was first minister of state; especially when by so doing he exposed his whole nation to imminent danger. Besides, if nothing but civil respect had been intended to Haman, the king need not have enjoined it on his servants after he had made him his first minister and chief favourite, Esth. iii. 1, 2; they would have been ready enough to show it on all occasions. Probably, therefore, the reverence ordered to be paid this great man was a kind of divine honour, such as was sometimes addressed to the Persian monarchs themselves; which being a species of idolatry, Mordecai refused it for the sake of a good conscience. And perhaps it was Haman's understanding that his refusal was the result of his Jewish principles, that was the very thing which determined him to attempt the destruction of the Jews in general, knowing they were all of the same mind. As to the

Third question, why Haman cast lots, in order to fix the day for the massacre of the Jews, Esth. iii. 7; from whence the feast of purim, which is a Persic word, and signifies lots,* took its name, chap. ix. 26; it was no doubt owing to the superstitious conceit, which anciently prevailed, of some days being more fortunate than others for any undertaking; in short, he endeavoured to find out, by this way of divining,

* Vid. Pfeifferi Dubia Vexat. centur. iii. loc. xxix. p. 486, 487, 3d edit. Lipsiæ.

what month, and what day of the month, was most unfortunate to the Jews, and most fortunate for the success of his bloody design against them. It is very remarkable, that while Haman sought for direction in this affair from the Persian idols, the God of Israel so over-ruled the lot as to fix the intended massacre to almost a year's distance, from Nisan the first month to Adar the last of the year, in order to give time and opportunity to Mordecai and Esther to defeat the conspiracy. Thus much for the feast of purim.*

The feast of dedication is in Greek termed *εγκαινια*, John x. 22, from *εγκαινιζω*, *renovo, instauro;* a word commonly used by the ancient Christian writers for an annual festival kept in commemoration of the building of cities, or dedication of churches. Thus Codinus, in his Origines Constantinopolis, saith, *τα εγκαινια της πολεως γεγονε και προσεγορευθη Κωνσταντινουπολις*,—"Encœnia urbis fuerunt celebrata, et Constantinopolis fuit appellata;"† and Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, speaks of the *εγκαινιων εορται*,‡ meaning the feasts of the dedication of churches. There is no doubt the *εγκαινια*, mentioned by St. John, were celebrated in commemoration of the dedication of the temple. Now the season of the year when this festival was observed, will enable us easily to determine what dedication of the temple it must refer to. The evangelist saith, "it was then winter;" it could not therefore be observed in commemoration of the dedication of Solomon's temple; for that was in the seventh month, or autumn, 1 Kings viii. 2; nor of the second, or Zerubbabel's temple; for that was in the month Adar, in the spring; Ezra vi. 15, 16. The festival here intended must, therefore, be that instituted by Judas Maccabeus, on his having purified the temple and the altar from the pollution of Antiochus Epiphanes, which was celebrated for eight days successively, in the month Chislau, about the winter solstice; 1 Macc. iv. 52—59. It is mentioned by Josephus as a festival much regarded in his time.§

* See, on this subject, Schickard. Oratiuncula de Festo Purim, apud Criticos Sacros, tom viii. † See Suicer. Thesaur. ad voc. Εγκαινια.

‡ Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. x. cap. iii. p. 463, 464, edit. Cantab. 1720.

§ Antiq. lib. xii. cap. vii. sect. vii. p. 617, edit. Havercamp.

The circumstance of Christ's walking in the temple at this feast, John x. 23, is alleged by Dr. Nichols,* Prideaux,† and others, in favour of the observance of sacred festivals of mere human institution; for though this was such an one, nevertheless Christ honoured it with his presence. But how will this prove, that our Lord had a more sacred or religious regard to this festival than it may be proved he had to the winter, from his walking in the temple at that season? Or if he chose to come to Jerusalem and to the temple at that time, when more people frequented the temple service than ordinarily at any other, the only reason might be the opportunity of preaching to greater numbers; on which account we find the apostles likewise frequented the synagogues upon the Jewish sabbath, even after that institution was abrogated.‡

Besides these two festivals, we read in Scripture of several other feasts, or fasts, observed by the Jews in later ages, though not appointed by the law of Moses; as the fast of the fourth month, on account of the taking of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, Jer. lii. 6, 7; of the fifth month, on account of their burning the temple and city, 2 Kings xxv. 8; of the seventh month, in memory of the murder of Gedaliah, ver. 25; and of the tenth month, when the Babylonian army began the siege of Jerusalem; Jer. lii. 4. These fasts are all mentioned together in the eighth chapter of Zechariah, ver. 19; to which we may perhaps add the feast, which Josephus calls *ξυλοφορια*, the feast of the wood-offering, when the people brought great store of wood to the temple for the use of the altar.§ This is said to be grounded on the following passages in Nehemiah: "We cast the lots among the priests, the Levites, and the people, for the wood-offering, to bring it into the house of our God, after the houses of our fathers, at times appointed year by year, to burn upon the altar of the Lord our God, as it is written in the law;" chap. x. 34.

* Nicholsii Defensio Eccles. Anglican. part ii. cap. xi. p. 298, 299, Londini, 1707.

† Connect. part ii. book iii. vol. iii. p. 278, 279, 10th edit.

‡ Vid. Peircii Vindic. Fratrum Dissent. part iii. cap. xi. p. 381, Londini, 1710, or the English Translat. part iii. chap. xi. p. 218, London, 1717.

§ Joseph. de Bell. Judaic. lib. ii. cap. xvii. sect. vi. p. 194, Havercamp.

Again, "I appointed the wards of the priests and the Levites, every one in his business; and for the wood-offering at times appointed, and for the first-fruits;" chap. xiii. 30, 31.

Besides these fasts and festivals, the modern Jewish calendar is crowded with a multitude of others;* of which, there being no mention of them in Scripture, it is beside our purpose to take any farther notice.

* Vid. Selden. de Synedriis Hebræor. lib. iii. cap. xiii. sect. xii.

APPENDIX,

CONCERNING

THE LANGUAGE OF THE JEWS.

ON

THE LANGUAGE OF THE JEWS.

To the large account given of the Jews and their religion, chiefly from the sacred records of the Old Testament, I shall now subjoin a dissertation on the languages in which those records were written; namely, the Hebrew and the Chaldee. However, as only a small part of the later writings are in Chaldee, our chief attention will be paid to the Hebrew. And here we shall consider,

1st. The antiquity of the language; and,

2dly. The language itself.

First, As to its antiquity. The Jews are very confident it was the first and original language, which, they say, was contrived by God himself, and which he inspired Adam with a complete knowledge of.* Accordingly those words, which we translate "Man became a living soul," Gen. ii. 7, are rendered in the Chaldee Paraphrase of Jonathan, "The breath, breathed into him by God, became in man a speaking soul." And to the same purpose the Paraphrase of Onkelos. But notwithstanding the confident assertions of the Jews, there are other persons who have taken the liberty to doubt of this opinion, not only as to the high antiquity of the Hebrew language, but as to such a divine original of any language at all.

1st. As to the original of language itself. Though the Jews assert their language was taught to Adam by God him-

* Vid. Buxtorf. Dissertationes Philologico-Theolog. dissert. i. de Ling. Hebr. Orig. et Antiquit. sect. xvii. p. 11—14; sect. xxx. p. 20—23, Basil. 1662.

self, yet they are not all agreed how far the divine institution reached. Abarbanel supposes, God instructed our first parents only in the roots and fundamental parts of the tongue, and left the further improvement to themselves:* but others, that they received the whole extent and propriety of the language by immediate revelation.† The same opinion hath been embraced by several Christians, particularly by Eunomius, who, because God is introduced by Moses as speaking before the creation of man, maintained that there was in words a certain eternal and immutable nature. But it is difficult to conceive what connexion there can be, for the most part, between sounds and things, except what is arbitrary, and fixed by consent or custom.‡ And Gregory Nyssen exposes it as ridiculous and blasphemous to imagine God would turn grammarian, and set him down subtilely to invent names for things.§ Dr. Shuckford‖ conceives, that the original of our speaking was indeed from God; not that he put into Adam's mouth the very sounds which he designed he should use as the names of things; but only, as he made him with the powers of a man, he had the use of an understanding to form notions in his mind of things about him, and he had power to utter sounds, which should be to himself the names of things, according as he might think fit to call them. These he might teach Eve, and in time both of them teach their children; and thus began and spread the first language of the world. Perhaps in this, as in many other disputes, the truth may lie between the extremes. If our first parents had no extraordinary divine assistance in forming a language, it must have been a considerable time before they would have been

* Abarbanel in Gen. ii. 19. See Buxtorf, ubi supra, sect. xxii. p. 15, 16.

† R. Jehudah in libro Cozri, et ejus commentator, R. Jehudah Muscatus. See Buxtorf, ubi supra, sect. xxi. p. 14, 15.

‡ Etsi homines (inquit Heidegger. Hist. Patriarch. tom. i. exercit. xvi. sect. iii. p. 443, Amstel. 1667) potentiam habeant sibi mutuò animi sui notionem per verba ceu αγγελους quosdam νοηματων expromendi, tamen ipsa verba non significant naturalitèr, hoc est per connexionem aliquam naturalem seu similitudinem verborum cum rebus; sed inveniuntur ex pacto et placito, vel certè per institutionem et consuetudinem addiscuntur.

§ Contra Eunom. lib. xii. See Heidegger. Histor. Patriarch. dissert. xvi. sect. v.—vii. tom. i.

‖ Shuckford's Connect. vol. i. book ii. p. 111.

able to converse freely together; which would have been a very great abatement of the pleasure of their paradisiacal state. Nevertheless, as, no doubt, God formed them with excellent abilities, it may reasonably be supposed he left them to exercise those abilities in perfecting a language upon the hints which he had given them.*

But in whatever way the original language was formed,

2dly. In the dispute, which was the original language, other nations have put in their claim with as much assurance as the Jews. The Armenians allege, that as the ark rested in their country, Noah and his children must have remained there a considerable time, before the lower and marshy country of Chaldea could be fit to receive them; and it is therefore reasonable to suppose they left their language there, which was probably the very same that Adam spoke.

Some have fancied the Greek the most ancient tongue, because of its extent and copiousness.†

The Teutonic, or that dialect of it which is spoken in the Lower Germany and Brabant, hath found a strenuous patron in Geropius Becanus,‡ who endeavours to derive even the Hebrew itself from that tongue.

The pretensions of the Chinese to this honour have been allowed by several Europeans.§ The patrons of this opinion endeavour to support it, partly, by the great antiquity of the Chinese, and their having preserved themselves so many ages from any considerable mixture or intercourse with other nations. It is a notion advanced by Dr. Allix,‖ and maintained by Mr. Whiston with his usual tenacity and fervour,¶ that the Chinese are the posterity of Noah, by his children born after the flood; and that Fohi, the first king of China, was Noah.

It is farther alleged in favour of the Chinese language,

* See Heidegger, ubi supra, sect. viii. ix.

† Eutych. Annales, p. 50.

‡ See his Origines Antwerpiæ, lib. v. p. 539, et seq.

§ See Webb's Essay toward discovering the Primitive Language.

‖ Reflections on the Books of the Holy Scripture, vol. i. part i. chap. xx. p. 112.

¶ Whiston's Theory, book ii. p. 137, et seq.; and his Short View of the Chronology, &c. p. 61, et seq. See also Shuckford's Connexion, vol. i. book i. p. 29; book ii. p. 98—104.

that, consisting of few words, and those chiefly monosyllables, and having no variety of declensions, conjugations, or grammatical rules, it carries strong marks of being the first and original language. Shuckford saith, it is so like a first uncultivated essay, that it is hard to conceive any other tongue to have been prior to it; and whether it was itself the original language or not, in respect to its consisting of monosyllables, the first language was no doubt similar to it. For it cannot be conceived, if men had at first known that plenty of expression which arises from polysyllables, any people or persons would have been so stupid as to reduce their language to words of one syllable only.*

As for those which are called the oriental languages, they have each their partisans; and of these the Hebrew and Syriac have the most votes. The generality of eastern writers allow the preference to the Syriac,† except the Jews, who assert the antiquity of the Hebrew with the greatest warmth; and with them several Christian writers agree, particularly Chrysostom,‡ Austin,§ Origen,‖ and Jerome,¶ among the ancients; and among the moderns, Bochart,** Heidegger,†† Selden,‡‡ and Buxtorf.§§ The chief argument, to prove the Hebrew the original language, is taken from the names of persons mentioned before the confusion of Babel, which, they say, are plainly of the Hebrew derivation. As אדם *Adam,* from אדמה *adamah,* the ground, because God formed him out of the earth: חוה *Eve,* or *Havah,* from היה *hajah, vixit,* because "she was the mother of all living:" קין *Cain,* from קיה *kajah, acquisivit:* שת *Seth,* from שוה *suth,*

* Shuckford's Connex. vol. i. book ii. p. 123, 124.

† Theodoret. Quæst. li. in Gen.

‡ Chrysostom. Homil. xxx. in Gen. xi. tom ii. p. 239.

§ Augustin. de Civitat. Dei, lib. xvi. cap. xi. xii.

‖ Origen. Homil. xi. in Numb. xviii.

¶ Hieron. in Soph. cap. iii. sect. xviii.

** Bocharti Phaleg, sive Geograph. Sacr. lib. i. cap. xv. Oper. tom. i. p. 50, 51, edit. 1712.

†† Heidegger, Histor. Patriarch. tom. i. exercitat. xvi. sect. xiv. et seq. tom. i. p. 455, et seq. Amstel. 1667.

‡‡ Selden. de Synedr. lib. ii. cap. ix. sect. iii. vol. i. tom. ii. p. 1420, 1421.

§§ Buxtorf. Dissertationes Philologico-Theolog. dissert. i. p. 21, et seq. Basil. 1662.

posuit: פלג *Peleg,* from פלג *palag, divisit;* and several others.

It is said these are plainly Hebrew names, and therefore, prove the Hebrew language to have been in use when they were given. Besides, it is alleged, the names of some nations are derived form Hebrew names. As Ιωνια, *Ionia,* from יון *Javan,* the son of Japhet. And so likewise of some heathen gods, as Vulcan, which seems to be a corruption of Tubal Cain; as Apollo does of Jubal. But Grotius* and others will not allow this argument to be conclusive, and therefore reply,

1st. There are many more patriarchal names, of which we can find no such Hebrew derivation, than there are of which we can; and it might very likely happen, that among such a multitude of names, some few might answer to the word which expressed the sense of that original word from whence the name was derived, in whatever language Moses had written. Thus, supposing he had written in Latin, and accordingly translated the name Adam into *homo,* it would have borne as near a relation to *humus,* the ground, as it does in the Hebrew to אדמה *adamah.*

2dly. We have no reason to conclude the names in the Mosaic history were the original names, and not translated by Moses into the language in which he wrote, since we have a plain instance of such a translation in his own name, which, as it was given him by Pharaoh's daughter, an Egyptian, cannot be supposed to have been originally Hebrew; therefore, not משה *Mosheh,* as he wrote it, but as it is in the Coptic version *Moüsi,* from *Moü,* which in that language signifies water, and *si,* taken. But Moses, finding the Hebrew word משה *mosheh,* to "draw out," bearing some resemblance in sound to his name, and in signification to the occasion of it, translated the Egyptian name *Moüsi* into the Hebrew *Mosheh.*

3dly. It is said, that several of those names are more pertinently derived from some other of the Oriental tongues than from the Hebrew: as *Abel,* or *Hebel,* which in Hebrew signifies vanity or a vapour, seems not a name very apposite to Adam's second son; and, therefore, Moses hath assigned no reason for his being called by that name. But if it

* Grotius in Gen. xi. 1.

be derived from the Syriac יהב איל *jehab eil*, which signifies *Deus dedit*, it is very proper and expressive. So the name *Babel*, which the Hebrew text informs us was so called because God did there בלל *balal*, that is, confound the language of all the earth, may be more naturally derived from the Syriac, in which tongue *Babel*, or *bobeel*, signifies confusion. So that the Syriac, or perhaps any other of the eastern tongues, might be proved, by this argument from the etymology of the names, to have been the original language, as well as the Hebrew.

Le Clerc farther advances, that several of these names were not the proper names, by which the persons were called from their birth; but *cognomina*, or sirnames, which were given them afterward on account of something remarkable in their lives, and which an historian would naturally have translated into his own language. Thus the Greek writers speak of Pelusia, a city of Egypt, which was so called απο του πηλου, from clay, because it stood in clayey ground; yet it can hardly be supposed this was its proper Egyptian name.

Upon the whole, Le Clerc's opinion seems to bid fairest for the truth, that neither the Hebrew, nor Syriac, nor Chaldee, nor any other language now extant, was the true original tongue; but that this, and the other Oriental tongues, have all sprung from, or are so many different dialects of that first language, itself now lost among them. As the Italian, French, and Spanish, are none of them the language of the ancient Romans, but all derived from it.*

Having failed in the attempt of tracing up the Hebrew language with any certainty to Adam, we are now to inquire to what people or nation it properly belonged after the confusion of Babel.

Those who are zealous for the high antiquity of the He-

* See on this subject Clerici Prolegom. i. in Pentateuch; Grotius in Gen. xi. 1; Heutii Demonst. Evang. prop. iv. cap. xiii. sect. iv.; Buxtorf. Dissertat. de Antiquitate Ling. Hebr. sect. xxvii.; Heidegger. Histor. Patriarch. tom. i. exercit. vi. sect. x.—xviii. p. 451—465; Walton. Prolegom. iii. sect. iii.—xii.; Pfeiffer. Dissert. de Ling. Protoplast. ad calcem Dub. Vexat., and his Critica Sacra, cap. iii.; Bocharti Phaleg. lib. i. cap. xv.; Vitring. Observationes, dissert. i. cap. i.—v.; Father Simon's Critical History, book i. chap. xiv. xv.

brew tongue, tell us, it was preserved, in the midst of that confusion, in the family of Eber, who, they say, was not concerned in the building of Babel, and consequently did not share in the punishment inflicted on those that were.

Before we examine this opinion, it may be no improper digression to consider briefly the account we have of that confusion, and of the origin of different languages, in the eleventh chapter of Genesis, where we read, that "the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech;" ver. 1. And again, ver. 6, 7, "The Lord said, Behold the people is one, and they have all one language." But God said, "Let us go down and confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech." And again, "The Lord did there confound the language of all the earth;" ver. 9. Now as to the degree of this confusion, and the manner in which it was effected, there is a great diversity of sentiments.

The modern Jews, as Julius Scaliger informs us,* understand it not of a multiplication of tongues, but of a confusion of those ideas which they affix to words. Suppose, for instance, one man called for a stone, another understood him to mean mortar, having that idea now fixed to the word; another understood water, and another sand. But though such a different connecting of ideas with the same words must needs produce a strange confusion among the people, enough to make them desist from their undertaking, nevertheless this by no means accounts for the diversity of tongues, which consists not in the same words being used in different senses, but in the use of words quite remote and different from one another.

Others are of opinion, that all the confusion which happened at Babel, was in the people's quarrelling among themselves, and thereupon bandying into parties, and separating from each other; which, they say, is ascribed to God in the same sense in which it is elsewhere said, there "is no evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it;" that is, permitted and overruled it to the accomplishment of his own wise and gracious designs.

As for the different languages now in the world, these

* Scalig. Exercitat. in Cardan. 259, sect. i. cited by Stillingfleet, Origen. Sacr. book iii. chap. v. sect. iii. p. 362, 8th edit. 1709.

gentlemen suppose, that they all arose at first from one original language, and that this variety is no more than must naturally have happened in so long a course of time, partly through the difference of climates, which, it is said, will occasion a difference of pronunciation, and thereby gradually a variation in languages; and from various other causes, which are sometimes observed to have so altered the language of some nations, that it hath hardly been intelligible at the distance of two or three hundred years. Thus the Salian verses, composed by Numa, were scarcely understood by the priests in Quinctilian's time.* "Saliorum Carmina," saith he, "vix sacerdotibus suis satis intellecta." And we find it no less difficult to understand the language of our forefathers three or four centuries ago.

To this hypothesis, that what is commonly called the confusion of tongues was only a difference of opinions, and the contentions consequent thereupon, it may be objected, that this does by no means come up to the obvious meaning of the sacred history, which tells us, "that God did there," even at Babel, "confound the language of all the earth;" which before was "one" and the same; implying, that in consequence of this extraordinary procedure of Providence, there was now a diversity of tongue, which occasioned their "not understanding one another's speech:" and likewise, that several of the present languages are so entirely remote from one another, that with no reasonable probability can they be supposed to have sprung from the same original. For though length of time may very much alter a language in its words and phrases, according to the observation of Horace,†

> Multa renascentur, quæ jam cecidere; cadentque,
> Quæ nunc sunt in honore vocabula, si volet usus:

yet what instance can be produced of mere length of time bringing a whole language out of use, and introducing another in the room of it. Besides, the greatest alterations of languages, of which any history since that of Babel informs us, have arisen from the intermixture of people of different languages. Thus the Roman language was corrupted and altered

* Quinctil. Institut. Orat. lib. i. cap. vi. p. 45, edit. Gibson, Oxon. 1693.
† De Artę Poeticâ, l. 70.

by the multitude of foreign slaves which were kept at Rome. But if all languages had originally sprung from one, such an intermixture of the people of different nations must have tended to prevent the diversity of language instead of promoting it.

Dr. Shuckford has an hypothesis, I suppose, peculiar to himself; that the builders of Babel were evidently projectors, and their heads being full of innovations, some of the leading men among them set themselves to invent new words, as particularly polysyllables, and to spread them among their companions, from whence in time a different speech grew up in one party from that in another, till at length it came to such a height, as to cause them to form different companies, and so to separate.*

It may be objected to this hypothesis, as well as to the former, that it by no means comes up to the obvious meaning of the sacred history. Besides, Theseus Ambrose† hath started another material objection, that the diversity of languages cannot be supposed to have arisen from choice and contrivance, unless it can be imagined that men would do themselves such a prejudice as that, when they had one common language to represent their conception, they should themselves introduce so great an alteration, as would break off that mutual society and converse which even nature itself dictated.

As to what Dr. Shuckford saith, that experience shows the fear of doing mischief hath not restrained the projects of ambitious men, it may be replied, that though it may not have restrained them from doing it to others, it surely will restrain them from doing it to themselves. And as to what he farther alleges, that he sees no detriment arising from the confusion of languages, let experience, and the immense pains men are forced to take in learning foreign languages, which they have occasion for, tell us, whether it be an inconvenience and detriment, or not.

Upon the whole, I can see no reason to depart from the obvious meaning of the historical narrative, which represents the confusion of tongues as the immediate act of God, but

* Shuckford's Connect. vol. i. book ii. p. 133.

† Theseus Ambros. de Causis Mutationis Linguarum.

think it right to conclude with Calvin, "Prodigii loco habenda est linguarum diversitas."*

It would be to little purpose to inquire, in what way and manner these new languages were formed; for though there are various, they are all uncertain conjectures about it.†

There is one inquiry more on this head, on which we shall briefly touch; namely, how many languages arose from the confusion of Babel.

The Jews make them seventy, imagining there were seventy different nations then planted in the world,‡ a notion which they ground on the following passage in Deuteronomy: "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel;" chap. xxxii. 8. That is, say they, he divided them into seventy nations, seventy being the number of the children of Israel when they came into Egypt.§ Bochart, however, hath given a far more probable sense of this passage, that God so distributed the earth among the several people that were therein, as to reserve, or in his sovereign counsel to appoint, such a part for the Israelites, though they were then unborn, as might prove a commodious settlement and habitation for them.‖

We have no way to determine how many languages sprung out of the first confusion. No doubt but their number hath been since multiplied; for we have instances in later ages of several languages growing out of one; the Italian, French, and Spanish, for instance, out of the Latin. And thus, probably, several eastern tongues, or dialects, arose out of one; but

* Calvin. Annot. in Gen. xi. 1, 2.

† See Buxtorf. Dissert. de Ling. Hebr. Confusione, et Plurimum Linguar. Origine; Vitring. Observat. dissert. i.; Stillingfleet's Origines Sacræ, book iii. chap. v. sect. iv.; Dr. Wotton's Discourse concerning the Confusion of Languages; and Dr. Brett's Essay on the same subject.

‡ Targum Jonathan in Gen. xi. 7, 8.

§ Targum Jonathan in Deut. xxxii. 8, and R. Bechai, quoted by Buxtorf, apud Dissertationes Philologico-Theolog. dissert. ii. de Ling. Hebr. Confus. sect. xliii. p. 79, where, and in the following pages, are many other testimonies to the same purpose.

‖ Bocharti Geograph. Sacra, lib. i. cap. xv. Oper. tom. i. p. 57, edit. 1712.

whether out of the antediluvian language, or some other, is by no means certain.

We now return to the inquiry, To what people, after the dispersion of the nations, the Hebrew language originally belonged. The opinion of the Jews hath been already mentioned that it was the language of Heber's family, from which Abraham sprung. But this is *gratis dictum*, or rather highly improbable, since we find Heber's family, in the fourth generation after the dispersion, living in Chaldea, where Abraham was born, Gen. xi. 27, 28; and there is no reason to think they used a different language from their neighbours around them. Now, that the Chaldee, and not the Hebrew, was the language of Abraham's country, and of his kindred, appears in that he sent his servant to his own country, and to his kindred, to take a wife for his son Isaac, namely, Rebekah, Gen. xxiv. 4; and that Laban, the brother of Rebekah, spake a different language from the Hebrew, namely, the Chaldee; for the same pillar, or heap of stones, which Jacob called גלעד *galgnedh*, which is a Hebrew word, Laban calls in his language יגר שהדותא *jegar sahadhutha*, which is pure Chaldee; Gen. xxxi. 46, 47. From whence it seems reasonable to conclude, that Abraham's native language was Chaldee, and that the Hebrew was the language of the Canaanites, which Abraham and his posterity learnt by dwelling among them. This Le Clerc hath endeavoured to prove,*

1st. From the names of places, as well as men, in the land of Canaan being pure Hebrew. Fuller, indeed, in his Miscellanies,† supposes, that Moses, in writing his history, translated the Canaanitish names into Hebrew, which, if well grounded, would entirely destroy the argument which he himself and others make use of to prove, that the Hebrew was the antediluvian language, from the names of some of the ancient patriarchs being pure Hebrew. But this does not seem to be the case as to the names of places in Canaan; for we find, that though the Israelites changed the names of some of them, yet their old names were as much Hebrew as their new ones. For instance, Mamre, which they changed into

* Vid. Clerici Prolegom. i. in Pentateuch. de Ling. Hebr.

† Fuller. Miscell. lib. iv. cap. iv. apud Criticos Sacros, tom. ix. p. 2398.

Hebron, Gen. xiii. 18; Kirjath-sepher, which they changed into Debir, Josh. xv. 15; and Lashem, which they changed into Dan; Josh. xix. 47.

It is farther observed, that the names of the cities of the Philistines, who were a part of the Canaanites not subdued by the Israelites, were probably Hebrew, such as Gaza, Ashdod, Gath, Ekron, &c.

2dly. Whereas the Egyptians, and other neighbouring nations, are called "a people of a strange language" to the Jews (Psalm cxiv. 1; lxxxi. 5), nothing like that is ever said of the Canaanites.

3dly. If none but Jacob's family had spoken Hebrew, where could Joseph have found an interpreter between him and his brethren, when he affected not to understand Hebrew? Gen. xlii. 23. Probably this interpreter was some Canaanite.

4thly. The Hebrew language seems, to this author, to have been originally formed by Polytheists, and such as worshipped deified heroes, particularly from the plural name of God, Elohim; and from those metaphorical descriptions of the Divine attributes, which are plainly borrowed from man, as the soul, the ears, the face, the eyes, the hands of God; which metaphors, he supposes, would never have been used, if the language had been originally formed by people who had no other notion of God but that of a pure spirit. It seems to have been originally the language of idolaters.

5thly. He alleges the testimony of Bochart, who shows, from some remains of the Phœnician language, that it was originally Hebrew.* Thus the chief magistrates of the Carthaginians, who were originally Phœnicians, or Canaanites, were called Suffites, which seems to be a corruption of the Hebrew word שפטים *shophetim*, judges.

The most material objection I can find against this hypothesis is taken from the thirteenth chapter of Nehemiah, ver. 24, where it is said, that some Jews having married wives of Ashdod, "their children spoke half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews' language." Now Ashdod was one of the cities of the Philistines, who were Canaanites; from whence, therefore, it should seem, that the

* Bocharti Chanaan, sive Geograph. Sacr. pars posterior, lib. ii. per totum.

Jews' language, namely, Hebrew, and that of the Canaanites, were not the same. But it may be answered,

1st. That this was after the captivity, when the Jews had in a great measure lost the Hebrew. So that by the Jews' language we may here rather understand Chaldee than Hebrew.

2dly. That the speech of Ashdod, perhaps, might differ from that of the Jews only in pronunciation and dialect; as the Ephraimites, Judges xii. 6, pronounced differently from the other tribes, while yet they all spoke Hebrew.*

Having thus endeavoured to trace the antiquity of the Hebrew language, we now come to consider the language itself.

It being common for people to find out peculiar excellencies in their own language, the Hebrews have done so in theirs; and many Christians have joined with them in bestowing high encomiums upon it, as superior to all others. But whether that be owing to its real intrinsic excellencies, or to its advocates being prejudiced in its favour, on account of so many of the sacred books being written in it, we do not pretend to determine.

This language is said to abound in the aptest etymologies and roots of the names both of men and things; that in it the names of brutes express their nature and properties more significantly and accurately than in any other known language in the world; that its words are concise, yet expressive; derived from a small number of roots, yet without the studied and artificial composition of the Greek and Roman languages; that its words follow each other in an easy and natural order, without intricacy or transposition; and above all, that it hath the happiest and richest fecundity in its verbs, of any known tongue, either ancient or modern; which arises from the variety and sufficiency of its conjugations; by means of which, as Bellarmine observes in his Hebrew Grammar, all the variety of significations into which it is possible for a verb to be branched out, are expressed with a very small variation either of the points, or of a letter or two, which in any other lan-

* For proof that the Hebrew was the language of the Canaanites, see also Joseph Scaliger, Epist. ccxlii. et ccclxii.; Walton. Prolegom. ii. sect. xiii.—xix.; Selden, cap. ii. Prolegom. de Diis Syris.

guage cannot be done without circumlocution. In a word, this language is said to be so concise, yet significant; so pathetic, yet free from lightness, or bombast, as of all others to approach nearest to the language of spirits, who need no words to convey their ideas to each other.

But whether this language deserves these high encomiums, in preference to all others, or not, yet as God hath thought fit to convey to us so great a part of his revelations thereby, it certainly concerns us to be well acquainted with it. But it is not my present business to teach it; nor do you need instruction from me on this head.

All I shall farther offer, with respect to the language itself, will regard the letters in which it is written.

Concerning these there are two controversies, one about the consonants, the other about the vowels, or points.

First, Concerning the consonants. It is disputed, whether the sacred books were originally written in the present Hebrew square character, otherwise called the Assyrian or Chaldee character, or in the old Samaritan. Each side of this question is warmly maintained by different critics, though the latter opinion is now more generally received.

Joseph Scaliger, in his notes upon Eusebius's Chronicon,* thinks it so evident that the sacred books were originally written in the Samaritan character, at least those of them written before the captivity, that he saith it is *luce clarius;* and, with the usual politeness of a great critic, calls those of the contrary opinion *semi-docti, semi-theologi, semi-homines,* and *asini.*

He, with others on this side of the question, conceives the Samaritan was the ancient Phœnician character, and constantly used by the Jews till the Babylonian captivity, when, learning the Chaldee character from the Babylonians, they preferred it to their own on account of its far superior beauty. So that by the time they returned from the captivity, they had in a manner quite disused their ancient character; for which reason Ezra found it requisite to have the sacred books transcribed into the Chaldee square character, and from that time the old character hath been retained only by the Samaritans.

* Scalig. Animadversiones in Euseb. Chronic. sub anno 1617, p. 111. See also his Epist. ccxlii. et cccIxii.

But there are others who strenuously contend for the antiquity of the present Hebrew letters, as if they, and no others, were the sacred character in which the holy Scriptures were originally, and have always been, written; and that the Samaritan was never used for that purpose, except among the Samaritans, who, in opposition, they say, to the Jews, wrote the law of Moses, which is said to be the only part of Scripture they received, in this character, different from that which was used by the Jews. Some of the talmudists,* indeed, are quoted by Father Morin, Bishop Walton,† and others, as having declared for the contrary side. Nevertheless, other talmudical writers maintain the antiquity of the present character.‡ And there is a remarkable passage in the tract Megillah, wherein, on occasion of its having been said by Moses, that the tables of the law were written on both their sides, מזה ומזה *mizzeh umizzeh*, on one side and on the other, Exod. xxxii. 15, we are informed, that the letters were cut through and through, so as to be seen and read on both sides. And when it is asked, how it was possible for the middle of the ס *samech* and ם *mem clausum*, or final mem, to support itself, the answer is, it was suspended by a miraculous power.§ Certainly those talmudical rabbies, who have advanced this story, did not at all dream of the Samaritan being the ancient Hebrew character; for the Samaritan *samech* and *mem* are of a quite different shape from the present Hebrew, and would have stood in need of no such miracle to support the middle of them. Not to add, that the Samaritans make no difference between the final, or the medial and initial letters.‖

Buxtorf¶ endeavours to reconcile these two opinions, by producing a variety of passages from the rabbies** to prove,

* Vid. Cocceii Excerpt. Gemar. Cod. Sanhedr. cap. ii. sect. xiij. p. 186.

† Walton. Polyglot. Prolegom. iii. sect. xxxii. xxxiii. p. 21.

‡ Vid. Excerpt. Gemar. ubi supra, p. 186, 187.

§ Talm. Babylon. Cod. Megillah, cap. i. et de Sabbatho, fol. 104, col. i. See Buxtorf, Dissert. Philologico-Theolog. diss. iv. sect. xvi. p. 174, 175.

‖ Universal History, book i. chap. vii. concerning the language, writing, and learning of the Jews, note (v.)

¶ Buxtorf, Dissertat. Philolog. Theolog. dissert. iv. de Literar. Hebraic. genuinâ antiquitate, sect. xiv. xv. xvii. xviii. xx. xlii.—xliv.

** In particular Maimon. et Bartenor in Mishn. tit. Jadaim, cap. ult. sect. v. tom. vi. p. 490.

that both these characters were anciently used; the present square character being that in which the tables of the law, and the copy deposited in the ark, were written; and the other character being used in the copies of the law which were written for private and common use, and in civil affairs in general; and that after the captivity Ezra enjoined the former to be used by the Jews on all occasions, leaving the latter to the Samaritans and to apostates. And whereas the talmudical rabbies style the Hebrew square characters אשורית *ashurith, scriptura Assyriaca,* this is said not to be a proper name, denoting the country where this character was used, and from whence it was borrowed, but to be *nomen appellativum,* derived from אשר *ashar, beatum reddere,* and to signify, therefore, *beata Scriptura,* the blessed Scripture. R. Gedaliah, indeed, supposes it was called the Assyrian character, because it was appropriated to sacred, and never employed for common purposes, before the captivity in Babylon, from whence it was brought by the elders, who alone had the knowledge of it by tradition.* However, a bare inspection of the two characters renders the supposition, that both of them should ever have been used at the same time, somewhat improbable; for whereas the Chaldee is one of the most beautiful, the Samaritan, on the contrary, is one of the most uncouth, unsightly, and puzzling characters that ever was invented; and it can hardly, therefore, be imagined, that if the Jews had been acquainted with one so much superior as the Chaldee, they would ever have used the other, unless out of a superstitious regard to it as sacred, and as deeming it a profanation to use it in common and civil concerns. But it can scarcely be believed, that such an idle and superstitious opinion prevailed among them in the times of Moses and the prophets.

The chief arguments, on both sides of this question, are as follow:—

First. Those who argue in favour of the present square character being the original, allege,

1st. The following passage of St. Matthew: "One jot or tittle shall not pass from the law till all be fulfilled;" chap. v. 18. From hence it should seem, that Iota, or Jod, was the least of the consonants, as indeed it is in the present Hebrew,

* Buxtorf. ubi supra, sect. xliv. p. 203.

but in the Samaritan it is one of the largest letters. Schickard calls this *argumentum Palmarium*.* But Bishop Walton replies, that, supposing Christ speaks here of the least letter of the alphabet, which, however, he does not admit, all that can be fairly inferred from it is, that the present Chaldee character was used in our Saviour's time, which is not denied by those who maintain the Samaritan to be the original.†

2dly. They allege the following passage of Isaiah: "Of the increase," לסרבה *lemarbèh*, "of his government and peace there shall be no end," &c., chap. ix. 7; where the word לסרבה *lemarbèh* hath a *mem clausum* in the middle of it, of which there are only two instances. It is imagined this contains a mystery, and signifies, that Christ should come *ex utero clauso*. But this mystery cannot be expressed in the Samaritan character, it having no *mem clausum*. The prophecy of Isaiah, therefore, it is said, was originally written in the present character. It is answered, that it is only *gratis dictum* there is any mystery in this letter; and the easiest way of accounting for it is by the carelessness of some transcriber.‡

3dly. They argue from the temper of the Jews, who, being an obstinate and superstitious people, would never have suffered their sacred character to be altered. But this is more than can be proved, especially if it was done by the direction of Ezra.

4thly. They say, that Ezra could not do this if he would, nor would he if he could. He could not do it, because it was impossible to make this alteration in all their copies. But it may be asserted as well, that the old English black letter, in which Bibles were formerly written and printed, could not be changed for the Roman, which we know is now universally used. It is farther said, that Ezra would not do it, had it been practicable; for since he blamed those that spake the language of Ashdod, Nehem. xiii. 23, he would not surely profane the sacred writings with a heathen character. But this argument supposes some sanctity in the shape of the let-

* Vid. Schickard, in Bechinath Happerushim, disp. v. p. 82, 83.

† Walton, ubi supra, sect. xxxvi. p. 23.

‡ Walton, ubi supra.

ters, which we can hardly imagine Ezra was so superstitious as to believe.

5thly. They argue from ancient coins found in Judea, with Solomon's head on the face, and the temple on the reverse, with a legend in the Chaldee or Assyrian character. But these medals were probably made by some knavish Christians, in order to get money by imposing on the pilgrims to the Holy Land.

The same may be said of some Hebrew inscriptions in the present character, upon the sepulchres of the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Rachel, and Leah, which R. Benjamin saith he saw in the year 1170.*

The arguments on the other side, for the Samaritan character being the original, are,

1st. From the account in the Second Book of Kings, chap. xvii. 28, that when the ten tribes were carried captive, and the Samaritans put in their room, they were annoyed with lions, upon which a Jewish priest was sent to teach them the manner of the God of the land, or the worship of Jehovah; in order to which he must certainly teach them the law; but we have no account of his teaching them the language or character; from whence it is presumed the law was then written in the character which the Samaritans used.

2dly. It is argued in favour of the Samaritan character from the authority of Jerome, who observeth, on occasion of the prophet Ezekiel's being ordered "to set a mark," in the Hebrew תו *tau*, "upon the forehead of the men that sigh and cry for the abominations done in the midst of Jerusalem," chap. ix. 4; that this mark was the sign of the cross, there being a resemblance of that figure in the *tau* of the ancient alphabet, which, saith he, is what the Samaritans now use. If so, the form of this letter must have been, as some assert it was, different in his time from what it is at present, in which the resemblance is very small.†

* Walton, ubi supra, sect. xxxv. p. 22. See Conringii Paradoxa de Nummis Hebræorum, cap. v.—vii. et xi. apud Crenii Fascicul. Secundum.

† Hieron. in loc. Antiquis, inquit, Hebræorum literis, quibus usque hodie utuntur Samaritani, extrema litera Thau crucis habet similitudinem. See Dr. Kennicott's second Dissertation on the state of the Hebrew Text, p. 49, 50, and Hieron. Alexandri. Epist. Jo. Morino, apud Antiquitates

3dly. The chief argument is taken from the old Jewish shekel, which on one side hath the pot of manna, and on the other, Aaron's miraculous rod that budded; with a legend on one side, "The shekel of Israel;" on the other, "Jerusalem the holy," both in Samaritan characters. Some of the shekels were in the possession of Rabbi Moses Nachmanides, and Rabbi Azarias,* among the Jews; and of Montanus,† and Villalpandus,‡ and others among the Christians.

Now this shekel could not belong to the Samaritans after the captivity, whose hatred to the Jews would never have suffered them to strike such an inscription on their coin, as "Jerusalem hackodesh." It must, therefore, have belonged to the Jews before the captivity, which consequently proves the Samaritan character to have been then in use. This argument seems, indeed, to be demonstration. Nevertheless, considering the many notorious impositions with respect to coins and medals, we should be well assured of the genuineness of these shekels,§ before we are absolutely determined by them.‖

Ecclesiæ Orientalis clar. virorum Card. Barbarini, &c. Dissertationibus Epistolicis enucleatus, epist. vi. p. 144, 145, Londini, 1682.

* Menor. Enaim, p. 171. See the passage apud Ezec. Spanheim. de usu et præstant. Numism. dissert. iv. p. 334, edit. Amstel. 1671; or in Hottinger de Nummis Oriental. dissert. iii. ad calcem Cippor. Hebr. p. 133—139, 2d edit. Heidelberg, 1662.

† Ariæ Montani Tubal-Cain, de Siclo, vol. iii. ab init. apud Criticos Sacros, tom. viii. p. 657, edit. Londini.

‡ Villalpandi Apparatus in Ezekielem.

§ Hottinger maintains the genuineness and great antiquity of these shekels, supposing at the same time that the Samaritan character was used only for civil and profane purposes, and not for writing the holy Scriptures. See his Crippi Hebr. dissert. iii. de Nummis Orientalibus. On the other hand, Conringius, in his Paradoxa de Nummis Hebræorum, cap. viii. ix., endeavours to prove they were struck after the captivity, in the times of the Asmonean princes, and of the Herods. See also Reland de Nummis Samaritanis, dissert. i.

‖ See, concerning the Hebrew letters, Ludov. Capell. de Antiq. Literar. Hebraic.; Morini exercitat. in Pentateuch. Samarit. exerc. ii. cap. iii. sect. iv. et seq.; Father Simon's Critical History of the Old Testament, book i. chap. xiii.; Pfeifferi Critica Sacra, cap. iv. sect. ii.; Leusden. Philolog. Hebræus; Prideaux's Connect. part. i. book vi. sub A, 446; and Scaliger, and Buxtorf, and Walton, as before quoted.

We proceed, now,

Secondly, To consider the points or vowels, concerning which there is likewise no little controversy, whether they are of the same antiquity and authority with the consonants, or of a later original. In the beginning of the sixteenth century, the famous Elias Levita, a German Jew, ventured to call their antiquity in question, and ascribed the invention of them to the Masorites of the school of Tiberias, about five hundred years after Christ. The book which he published on this subject, soon raised him a cloud of adversaries, both of his own nation and among Christians. Of the latter were principally the two Buxtorfs; the father, in his book called "Tiberias, sive Commentarius Masoreticus;" and the son, in his "Tractatus de Punctorum, Vocalium, et Accentuum, in libris Veteris Testamenti Hebraicis, Origine, Antiquitate et Authoritate;"* which he wrote in answer to Ludovicus Capel, a Protestant divine, and Hebrew professor at Saumur, who in his "Arcanum Punctationis" had espoused Levita's opinion; as did likewise Joseph Scaliger,† Morinus,‡ Drusius,§ and several other critics.

This controversy hath employed the learned for upwards of two hundred years.

I shall first give an account of the several hypotheses which have been advanced on this subject, and then of the arguments *pro* and *con*.

The hypotheses are,

1st. That the points are coeval with the consonants, and were written along with them in the original copies of the sacred law.

The second is, that they were added by Ezra, at the time when he is supposed to have changed the old Samaritan for the Assyrian or Chaldee character.

The third is, that they were invented and added by the Masorites of the school of Tiberias, certain Jewish gram-

* See Buxtorf. de Antiquitate Punctor. part. ii. cap. xi.

† Scaliger, Epist. ad Buxtorf. 243.

‡ Morin. Exercitat. Biblicæ, exercit. vi. et Epist. Buxtorfio apud Antiquitates Ecclesiæ Orientalis, &c.; Dissertationibus Epistolicis enucleatus, epist. lxx. præsertim, p. 368, ad finem.

§ Drusius ad Loca Difficil. Pentateuch. cap. 25.

marians, who devoted themselves to the revisal of the Hebrew text, and, in order to prevent any future alterations, numbered the sections, words, and letters, in each book.

The school of Tiberias in Galilee was a very famous one, and flourished long after the destruction of the second temple. The grammarians, or critics, of that school, commonly called Masorites, are supposed to have invented the points after the completion of the Talmud. The Papists generally embrace this hypothesis, because, in their opinion, it serves the cause of oral tradition, and hath a tendency to weaken the authority and sufficiency of the sacred text; and for other reasons several Protestants have received it. As for Capel, the most celebrated Christian champion for this hypothesis, although he agrees with Elias Levita in ascribing the first edition of the points in the text to the Masorites of Tiberias, he nevertheless differs from him in this, that he makes the invention of them to be purely human, and so represents them as of no authority; whereas Levita supposes the points expressed the true and genuine reading, which had been preserved and handed down by tradition from the first writers of the sacred books; so that in effect they are of equal authority with the consonants.

There is yet a fourth hypothesis of Dr. Prideaux, who goes a middle way between those who contend for the points being coeval with the consonants, or at least for their being added by Ezra under divine inspiration, and those who allow them no higher original than the school of Tiberias. He conceives they were added by more ancient Masorites, soon after Ezra, when the Hebrew ceased to be a living language; but did not come into common use, nor were taught in the divinity schools, till after the compiling of the Talmud. There were anciently two sorts of schools among the Jews, the schools of the Masorites, and the schools of the Rabbies. The former only taught the Hebrew language, and the reading of the Scriptures in it; the latter, the understanding of the Scriptures, and the traditional interpretation of them. Now the vowel points, Dr. Prideaux supposes, were in use in the schools of the Masorites several ages before they were introduced into the schools of the Rabbies; and thus he accounts for their not

being mentioned in the Talmud, nor by the ancient Christian fathers before the time of the Masorites of Tiberias.*

We now proceed to consider the arguments for and against these different hypotheses.

First. For the antiquity and divine authority of the points, whether coeval with the consonants, or added by Ezra.

To prove that they were not invented by the Masorites of Tiberias, it is alleged,

1st. That there is no mention in any Jewish writer, of such an alteration being made in the Hebrew Bible; which doubtless there would have been, had it been fact.†

2dly. That all the annotations or notes of the Masorites, upon the vowels, relate to the irregularity of them. For instance, in their commentaries on the nineteenth chapter of Genesis and the second verse, they observe, on the word הִנֵּה *hinne, ecce*, which ought regularly to have been הִנֵּה *hinnè*, that every הנה *hinne* in this sense is with *kametz parvum* (by which they mean the vowel which we call *tzeri*), except only in this place. And in the sixteenth chapter of Genesis, there being in the thirteenth verse שֵׁם *shèm*, which in the fifteenth verse is שֵׁם *shem*, they remark, that every שם *shèm*, is with a *kametz parvum*, except six. Now had the Masorites been the inventors of the points, it is not to be thought they would have made them irregular according to their own judgments; consequently they must have had these irregular points in the copies that were before them.‡ But it is observed, that though we should suppose the Masorites of Tiberias invented the points, yet others, perhaps several ages afterward, might make critical remarks upon them: for the Masorah, as printed in our present Bibles, saith Dr. Prideaux, is a collection and abridgment of the chief criticisms made on the Hebrew text from the beginning.§

* Prideaux's Connect. part i. book v. vol i. p. 5—520, 10th edit.

† Pfeifferi Critica Sacra, cap. iv. sect. ii. quæst. ii. p. 83, 84, Lipsiæ, 1712.

‡ Buxtorf. Tiberias, cap. ix. p. 47, et seq. edit. Basil. 1665; et Buxtorf. Fil. de Punctorum Antiquitate, part. ii. cap. vi. p. 338, et seq.

§ Capelli Arcanum Punctationis, lib. ii. cap. x. xi.; Prideaux's Connect. part. i. book v. vol. ii. p. 504, 10th edit.

3dly. There is express mention of the points or vowels in books more ancient than the Talmud; namely, Bahir and Zohar: the first of which is said to have been written a little before our Saviour's time; and the second, which quotes and refers to it, not much above a century after.* Buxtorf the elder quotes the following passage, among others, out of Bahir: "Talia sunt puncta cum literis legis Mosis qualis est anima vitæ in corpore." But these two books are rejected by Capel† and others, as spurious and modern. Prideaux saith, there are many particulars in them, which manifestly prove them to be so, and that, for above a thousand years after the pretended time of their composure, they were never heard of, quoted, or mentioned.‡

4thly. That the points were in use in our Saviour's time, and therefore long before the Masorites of Tiberias, is argued from the following passage of St. Matthew: "One iota, or κεραια," which we translate tittle, "shall not pass from the law;" chap. v. 18. The tittles, or points, therefore at that time belonged to the law.§ But Capel understands by the κεραιαι, not the points, but the *corollæ*, or flourishes, sometimes made about the Hebrew consonants.‖

For the high antiquity of the points, and that they must be coeval with the consonants, it is argued,

1st. That as it is impossible to pronounce the language without vowels, so it would be alike impossible to teach it, unless the vowels were expressed.¶ And,

2dly. If it be allowed, that the present vowel points are not of the same authority with the consonants, but merely of human and late invention, it will greatly weaken the authority of the holy Scriptures, and leave the sacred text to an arbitrary and uncertain reading and interpretation.**

* Buxtorf. Tiberias, cap. ix. sect. iii. p. 70; Buxtorf. Fil. de Antiq. Punctorum, part i. cap. v. p. 68, et seq.

† Capell. Arcanum Punctat. lib. ii. cap. iii.; et Vindiciæ Arcani, lib. i. cap. viii. sect. xiii. et seq.

‡ Prideaux's Connect. part i. book v. vol. ii. p. 501, 502, 10th edit.

§ Buxtorf. Fil. de Punctorum Antiquitate, part ii. cap. xv. p. 435, 436.

‖ Capelli, Arcanum Punctationis, lib. ii. cap. xiv.; and Vindiciæ Arcani, lib. ii. cap. xiii.; see also Marckii Sylloge Dissertationum, exercitat. iii.

¶ See Buxtorf. de Punctor. Antiq. part. ii. cap. i. p. 305, et seq.

** Buxtorf. Tiberias, cap. ix. p. 86; et Buxtorf. Fil. de Punctor. Antiq.

It is indeed advanced by the gentlemen on the other side of the question, that the *aleph, he, vau, jod,* and *gnain,* originally served for vowels.* To which it is replied, that there are multitudes of words, in which none of these letters occur.† And it is certain they were not in all words in Jerome's time, who in his commentary on Isaiah saith, that the word דבר *dhabhar,* is written with three letters.‡ But Capel thinks it reasonable to suppose, that neither Moses nor Ezra would have used the *aleph, vau,* and *jod* at all, if they had been the authors of the points, which render these letters needless. And though all words have not these *matres lectionis,* yet wherever they are wanting, they may easily be supplied in reading, by those who are skilled in the tongue, as the persons undoubtedly were to whom it was a native language.§ To which some have added, that these letters have been struck out of many words, in which they were formerly written, as being of no use since the invention of vowel points. To this it can only be replied, If that were the case, many "iotas must have perished from the law." Besides, who would venture to expunge these letters? Not, surely, the Masorites; who were so superstitiously scrupulous and exact, as to preserve even the irregularities of the letters; and having counted and set down the number of the letters contained in each book, they thereby placed a guard against its being done by any body after them. But notwithstanding all their care,‖ it is certain the *matres lectionis* have been sometimes omitted; for they are more frequent in some of the older manuscripts than in later manuscripts, or in the printed text.¶

part ii. cap. xiv. p. 419, et seq.; Carpzovii Critica Sacra, part i. cap. v. sect. vii. p. 243—248.

* Capelli Arcanum Punctationis, lib. i. cap. xviii. xix.

† Buxtorf. de Punctorum Antiq. part i. cap. xiv. p. 198; et part ii. cap. viii.

‡ Hieron. in Isa. iii. 8.

§ Capel. Vindiciæ Arcani, lib. ii. cap. vi.

‖ Concerning the inconsistency and imperfection of the Masorah, and its insufficiency to guard the purity of the sacred text, see Capelli Critica Sacra, lib. v. cap. xii. p. 373, et seq.; lib. iii. cap. xvi. p. 156. 186; cap. xix. p. 203; Dr. Kennicott's first Dissert. on the Hebrew Text, p. 247, 261, et seq., 297, et seq., 348, 349. 546, 547; second Dissert. p. 245, et seq., 262—291. 451. 468, 469; and in some other places.

¶ See Dr. Kennicott's first Dissert. on the Hebrew Text, p. 303.

The foregoing arguments for the antiquity of the points are produced, chiefly, by Buxtorf. We come now,

Secondly, To consider the arguments against the antiquity of the points, by which Capel endeavours to prove, they were added by the Masorites of Tiberias. These are drawn from grammar, from testimony, and from history.

1st. The grammatical arguments are built principally upon the *keri* and *chethibh*. The *chethibh*, from כתב *chathabh*, *scripsit*, is the reading in the text, the *keri*, from קרא *kara*, *legit*, the reading in the margin. Generally the wrong one is in the text, and the true in the margin. Some of the more modern rabbies ascribe these marginal corrections, or various readings, to Ezra. Abarbanel imputes the *chethibhim*, the irregularities and anomalies in the text, to the original writers, who designed to comprise some mysteries in them. Or, he thinks, they might, in some instances, be owing to their inadvertency, or to their want of skill in grammar and orthography; and that Ezra, not willing to insert in the text his corrections even of the mistakes of the original writers, contented himself with placing them in the margin. Elias Levita very absurdly maintains, that the various readings themselves were derived by tradition from the original writers.* The first of these opinions is the most plausible; namely, that Ezra, in reviewing the different copies, in order to publish a perfect edition, marked the several variations, and put one reading in the text, and the other in the margin. But it is a strong objection to Ezra's having done it, that such marginal readings, different from the text, are found in the book of Ezra itself, who cannot be supposed to have been in doubt of the true reading of his own writings; and therefore they must, at least partly, have been inserted since Ezra's time.†

Further, it should seem that these marginal corrections were not in the copies from whence either the Seventy, the Chaldee Paraphrast, Aquila, Symmachus, or Theodosian, made their versions; since they sometimes follow the *keri*, sometimes the *chethibh*; whereas had these marginal corrections

* Capelli Critica Sacra, lib. iii. cap. xiv.

† That the Kerioth were properly a collection of various readings, whoever made the collection, is well proved by Dr. Kennicott, second Dissert. on the Hebrew Text, p. 281, et seq.

been in their copies, they would doubtless, ordinarily, if not always, have followed them. Neither Josephus, nor Philo, nor Origen, nor Jerome, make any mention of the *keri* and the *chethibh;* nor does the Mishnah. The Gemara, indeed, mentions those words which were written but not read, and those which were read but not written, as also obscene words, instead of which were read others that are more pure and chaste. But it does not take notice of the other part of the *keri* and *chethibh,* namely, those words which are written, and read in a different manner. From all this it is concluded, that the *kerioth* began to be collected a little before the completion of the Talmud, probably by the Masorites of Tiberias.* From hence Capel argues against the antiquity of the points, endeavouring to prove that they have no higher an original than the *keri* and the *chethibh:* and for this he offers the following reasons:—

First. The *kerioth* are various lections of the consonants only; there are none of the vowels or points, as doubtless there would have been, had the points been in the copies from whence the *kerioth* were made.†

Secondly. There are certain irregularities in the punctuation, which show that the points were not in the copies from whence the *keri* and the *chethibh* were made. Now these irregularities are observed, both in whole words, and in parts of words.

1st. In whole words; these are either single words, or words combined, or divided. Those in single words are when the consonants are either redundant, or defective, or are wholly suppressed. Of the first sort, there is an instance in the fifty-first chapter of Jeremiah and the third verse; where יִדְרֹךְ *jidhroch* is written twice. And this superfluous word hath no points: which is thus accounted for; that those who settled the *keri* and *chethibh,* finding the word in their copies, durst not strike it out, but perceiving it to be an erratum, and superfluous, they would not point it: whereas, had it been pointed in their books, they would doubtless have given it as they found it, and no more have dared to expunge the vowels than the consonants. Hence it is inferred, that

* Capell. Critica Sacra, lib. iii. cap. xiv. xv.

† Capell. Arcanum Punctationis, lib. i. cap. vii.

the *kerioth* were more ancient than the points, and that the copies which supplied them were unpointed.

Of the second sort, where the consonants are defective, we have an instance in the thirty-first chapter of Jeremiah, and the thirty-eighth verse; where we have the vowels of a word in the *chethibh*, without the consonants, which consonants are supplied in the *keri;* and without which supplement the text is not sense. The Masorah observes eleven instances of this kind. Now it cannot be thought the words were written thus originally, or by Ezra, or that any other transcriber through carelessness should omit the consonants, while he set down the vowels. Therefore it is supposed, that those who invented the points, found the word omitted, doubtless through the incuria of some transcriber; yet durst not put the consonants in the text, but in the margin, and the vowels only in the text.

There are also instances of the consonants being suppressed in reading the text, by other consonants being put in their room in the margin; as, when the original word seemed to those who invented the vowels to be obscene, and therefore not proper to be read, they have substituted another word in the margin, and put the vowels proper to that word under the word in the text: for instance, in the eighteenth chapter of the Second Book of Kings, and the twenty-seventh verse; where the consonants in the text cannot be read with the vowels annexed to them, which evidently belong to the consonants in the margin. We cannot, therefore, suppose, that the vowels in the text were originally affixed to the words they are now under, or that they were put to those words before the invention of these marginal readings.*

There are observations likewise made on the combinations of words. Thus the word מאשתם *meeshtam*, in the sixth chapter of Jeremiah and the twenty-ninth verse, ought to be written in two words, as in the margin; for the punctuation is not just if the consonants are joined together; but agrees very well with the consonants if they are divided.

Sometimes, again, we find one word broke into two in the text, which are joined together, as they should be, in the margin. In the thirty-fourth chapter of the Second Book of Chronicles, and the sixth verse, בחר בתיהם *bechar bothehem*,

* Capell. Arcanum Punctat. lib. i. cap. xi. especially sect. vi.—ix.

ought certainly to be one word, as in the margin; otherwise the punctuation is very irregular. Now the books of Chronicles are generally supposed to have been written by Ezra. But whoever wrote them, it cannot be imagined, that this irregular punctuation was in the original copy; but the consonants happening to be afterwards divided through the incuria of the transcriber, those who invented the points, fixed them as if it had been, what it ought to have been, one word. Thus much for the irregularities observed in whole words.*

2dly. The irregularities which are observed in parts of words, or letters, are,

1st. A pleonasm, when there are superfluous letters, either in the beginning, middle, or end of a word. In the beginning: as בבִּית for בִּית *beth*, 2 Kings xxii. 5; Jer. lii. 11: יצאוּ for צאוּ *tseu*, chap. l. 8. In the middle; as בְּרֹכֵב for בְּרֵב *berobh*, 2 Kings xix. 23: וּלְהַלֶּחֶם for והלחם *vehallechem*, 2 Sam. xvi. 2. In the end: as אִשָּׁה for איש *ish*, 2 Sam. xxiii. 21: לָעָיִר and בָּעָיִר for לעי *langnai*, and בעי *bangnai*, Josh. viii. 12: in all which places the superfluous letter hath no vowel to it; which shows, that the vowels were affixed to the text since these errors crept into it.

2dly. An ellipsis, or the omission of a letter, either in the beginning of a word, as עֲשֶׂה for יעשה *jangnaseh*, 1 Sam. xx. 2; where the vowel is in the text, under the place of the consonant which is omitted. So likewise לְא for ולא *velo*, Lam. ii. 2: אֵין for ואין *veein;* chap. v. 7. Or in the middle of a word: as תַּחֲפַנְחֶם for תחפנחם *taccaphanchem*, Jer. ii. 16: אֲנַחְנוּ for אנחנו *anachnu*, chap. xlii. 6; where the *nun* and *cheth* are both wanting. Or at the end of a word: as אָמְרִ for אמרו *omru;* 1 Sam. xviii. 19.

3dly. Permutation, or changing one letter for another: as וְדָכָה for ידכה *jidhcha*, *vau* for *jod*, Psalm x. 9; which error occurs in twenty-two places: יְשָׁאַל for ושאל *veshaal*, *jod* for *vau*, Prov. xx. 4.; Psalm lxxvii. 12; which error occurs seventy-five times: גָּרָל for גדל *gedhal*, *resh* for *daleth*, Prov. xix. 19: הָיָה for היו *haju*, *he* for *vau*, Josh. xv. 4:

* Capell. Arcanum, ubi supra, sect. x.

and עֶבְדֶּךָ for עבדך *gnabhdhecha, vau* for *caph final;* 2 Sam xiv. 22.

4thly. Metathesis, or transposition: as יָמֹת for ימות *jamuth,* Prov. xix. 15: יְמוֹת for יומת *jumath;* 2 Kings xiv. 6.

5thly. Separation; when a letter is prefixed to one word, which belongs to the next word before it: as הָיִתָה מְוֹצִיא for היית המוציא *hajitha hammotsi,* 2 Samuel v. 2: שַׁמַּהּ הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים for שמה פלשתים *shammah phelishtim;* 2 Sam. xxi. 12.

From these and the like instances Capel infers, that the punctuation was regulated by, and consequently is more modern than the *kerioth;** the time of collecting which, as I have already observed, he endeavours to fix to about five hundred years after Christ. We proceed now to the

Second class of arguments against the antiquity of the vowels, which are drawn from testimony; and that, according to Capel, is either tacit or express.

Of the latter sort is the testimony of Aben Ezra, R. David Kimchi, R. Jehudah Levita, and R. Elias Levita, who are all of this opinion.†

Tacit or consequential testimony is taken from the copies of the law, which are kept and read in the synagogues, or from the cabalistic interpretation, or from passages of the Talmud.

1st. From the copies of the law, called ספר-תרה *sepher-torah,* written on a scroll of parchment, and read every sabbath in the Jewish synagogues. These copies are accounted by them the most sacred, and preferred to all others; and they are constantly written without points. But had the points been of equal authority with the consonants, doubtless a pointed law would have been always looked upon as the most sacred.‡

2dly. From the cabalistical interpretations, which relate to the consonants, and none of them to the vowels. And hence

* Capell. Arcanum Punctat. lib. i. cap. xi. sect. xi. et seq.

† Capell. Arcanum Punctat. lib. i. cap. ii. iii.; Buxtorf. de Punctor. Antiq. cap. iii. p. 11, et seq.; et Capell. Vindiciæ, lib. i. cap. i.

‡ Capell Arcanum Punctat. lib. i. cap. iv.

it is inferred, that the vowels were not in being when those interpretations were made.*

3dly. From the Talmud, which contains the "jura et decisiones magistrorum suorum," the determinations of the doctors concerning some passages of the law. It is evident, they say, the points were not affixed to the text when the Talmud was composed, because there are several disputes concerning the sense of passages of the law, which could not have been disputed had there been points. Besides, they never mention the vowels, though they have the fairest opportunity and occasion to mention them, had they been then in being. In the commentary on this passage of the First Book of Kings, "After he," that is, Joab, "had smitten every male in Edom," chap xi. 15, the Talmud relates, that when Joab returned from this expedition he told David, that he had smitten every male in Edom. David asked him, why he had left the females alive? Joab answers, The law says זכר *zakar*. No, saith David, we read זכר *zeker*, *memoria*. Whereupon Joab went to ask his master how he read this word? His master read it *zeker;* and upon this Joab drew his sword, with a design to murder him. Now had there been points at this time, it would have been impossible to have made this mistake: and had there been points when the Talmud was written, there would have been no room to have invented this story, for the points determine it to be *zakar*. And besides, if the talmudists had been in possession of vowel points, they would certainly have made use of them in telling this story, that so the sense might have been plain, and not liable to be misunderstood; whereas the two words are no ways distinguished, being both written with the consonants only.

Another instance of this sort occurs in the twelfth chapter of Leviticus and the fifth verse, where the talmudists dispute about the meaning of the word שבעים. These consonants signify either two weeks, or seventy days. Now had the vowel points been then used, they would have had the fairest opportunity of saying it must be two weeks, because there is a *kibbutz* under the *beth;* and they would doubtless have

* Capell. ubi supra, cap. v. sect. i.—iii.

written it שִׁבְעַיִם *shebhungnaim;* whereas they put down only the consonants.

Again, on the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah and the seventeenth verse they dispute, whether כל-בניך signifies children, or builders. The consonants may signify either, but the vowels determine it to mean children.*

We proceed now to the

Third sort of arguments, which Capel draws from the Chaldee Paraphrases of Jonathan and Onkelos, the Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, and especially that of the Septuagint, by which he endeavours to prove, that the copy from which they translated was without points. This appears with respect to them all, from their translating several words in a sense different from that which the points determine them to mean. I shall select some instances from the Septuagint only. In the fifteenth chapter of Genesis, and the eleventh verse, for וַיַּשֵּׁב אֹתָם *vajjashèbh otham,* "he drove them away," the Seventy read וַיֵּשֶׁב אִתָּם *vajjèshèbh ittam,* and accordingly render it και συνεκαθεσεν αυτοις, he sat down by them (that is, the carcasses), to watch them, that the fowls might not devour them. In the forty-seventh chapter and the thirty-first verse, for הַמִּטָּה *hammitah,* a bed, they read הַמַּטֶּה *hammatteh,* a staff, and accordingly translate it ραβδου αυτου. In the eighteenth chapter and the twelfth verse, for עֶדְנָה *gnedhnah,* pleasure, they read עַדָּנָה *gnadhennah,* hitherto, rendering it εως του νυν. In the thirty-second Psalm and the fifth verse, "I said, I will confess my transgressions," or upon my transgressions, for עֲלֵי *gnalèi,* upon, they read עָלַי *gnalai,* rendering it κατ' εμου (Psalm xxxi. in the Greek). In the forty-seventh Psalm and the tenth verse, for עַם *gnam,* the people, they read עִם *gnim,* with; instead of "the people of the God of Abraham," it is in their version μετα του Θεου Αβρααμ, with the God of Abraham. In the thirty-third Psalm and the seventh verse, instead of כַּנֵּד *cannedh,* like a heap, they read כְּנֹד *cannodh,* like a bottle, rendering it ωσει ασκον. In the ninth

* Capell. ubi supra, sect. iv. et seq.

chapter of Hosea and the first verse, for אֵל *el*, to, they read, אַל *al*, not, rendering it μηδε. In the first chapter of Joel and the eighteenth verse, for נָבְכוּ *nabhochu*, are perplexed, they read נִבְכוּ *nibhchu*, wept, from בכה *bachah*, *flevit;* and accordingly they render it εκλαυσαν. From these and several other instances it is inferred, that the translators of the Septuagint had no Bible with points; or, at least, that the copy they translated from was not printed as ours is.

The instances of the like sort, which Capel produces out of the Chaldee Paraphrases, and other ancient versions, are not so evidently to the purpose of his argument as those from the Septuagint.

Let us now see what is replied to these arguments of Capel by Buxtorf and others, who contend for the high antiquity and authority of the Hebrew points.

First. As to the argument drawn from the *keri* and *chethibh*:—

Buxtorf admits the *keri* and *chethibh* to have been prior to the points; and therefore, in order to maintain his opinion, that Ezra was the author of the points, he asserts, that it was Ezra, and not the Masorites of Tiberias, who first collected the *kerioth*, and then regulated by them the punctuation in the text.* We have already taken notice of the reasons which Capel offers on the contrary, for allowing the *kerioth* no higher antiquity than the time of the Masorites of Tiberias.

There are others, who assert, that the various lections, which are to be found in the Masorah, and part of which are inserted in the margin of the Hebrew Bible, are made upon the vowels as well as upon the consonants;† and they endeavour to show, that the various lections upon the consonants are owing to the irregularity of the vowels; and if so, the vowels must have been prior to these marginal corrections. Thus they prove the antiquity of the points from the *keri* and *chethibh;* and their argument is this: There are many in-

* Buxtorf. de Antiq. Punctor. part. i. cap. viii.; and, on the other side, Capell. Vindiciæ Arcani, lib. i. cap. ix.

† See Whitfield's Dissertation on the Hebrew Vowel-points, sect. ix. p. 134, et seq. Liverpool, 1748.

stances, where the consonants in the margin are plainly fitted to the vowels in the text. But had there been no vowels in the text when the *keri* were made, there would have been no occasion for these corrections; for the text might have been read with other vowels, and the sense of it much mended. For instance, in the eighth chapter of Genesis and the seventeenth verse, where the word in the text is הַוְצֵא *havtsè*, bring forth, the *keri* reads היצא *hajjetsè*, divide; which is plainly suited to the punctuation in the text; for had there been no points, they would rather have read it הוצֵא *hotsè*, as it ought to be, and then there would have been no occasion for this marginal correction. There is much such another instance in the fifth Psalm and the ninth verse, where הַוְשַׁר *havshar* in the text is corrected by הישר *hajshar* in the margin; whereas it ought to be הוֹשַׁר *hoshar*, or הוֹשֵׁר *hoshèr*, in the imperative *hiphil*, from ישר *jashar*, *rectus fuit*. In the twenty-first Psalm and the second verse, the word יָגֵיל *jageil*, *exultabit*, is changed in the *keri* into יגל *jagel*; but the consonants in the text are regular in *hiphil*, and should be pointed יָגִיל *jagil*. There could, therefore, be no reason for the *keri* to leave out the letter *jod*, but only to make the consonants suit to the erroneous punctuation in the text. In the fifty-first Psalm and the fourth verse, הֶרֶבֶּה *multiplica*, in the text, is corrected by הרב *herebh* in the margin. Now had there been no points in the text, they would doubtless have read הַרְבֵּה *harbèh*, of which הֶרֶב *herebh* is nothing but a contraction. In the fifty-ninth Psalm and the sixteenth verse, יְנוּעוּן *jenungnun*, *vagabuntur*, is made in the *keri* יניעון, suited to the erroneous punctuation, יְנִיעוּן; for had there been no points, instead of making this correction, they would doubtless have read it יְנוּעוּן, as it ought to be; for the sense is plainly in *kal*. In the seventy-seventh Psalm and the twelfth verse, אֶזְכִּיר *recordabor;* in the margin it is אזכור *ezchor;* whereas it might have been as well read אַזְכִּיר *azchir* in *hiphil*. In Psalm the eighty-ninth and eighteenth verse, תָּרִים *exultabit*, is changed by the *keri* into תרום *tarum*, in *kal;* whereas תָּרִים *tarim*, in *hiphil*, better

agrees with the context. See more instances of the kind in the eighty-fifth Psalm and first verse, the hundred and fifth Psalm and eighteenth and twenty-eighth verses, the hundred and fortieth Psalm and ninth verse, the hundred forty-fifth Psalm and sixth and eighth verses; and especially the thirtieth Psalm and the fourth verse, where מִיָּרְדִי from ירד *jaradh*, *descendit*, is corrected in the *keri* by leaving out the *vau*, and so making it the infinitive or gerund *kal*, with the affix *jod*, מירדי, *a descendere me*; whereas the sense is better if we retain the *vau*, and point it as the participle מִיֹּרְדֵי *mijjoredhei*; according to the Seventy, who render it *απο πων καταβαινοντων*; which is followed in the old English version, "Thou shalt keep my life from them that go down into the pit." This instance is said to have convinced Pocock, above all others, of the antiquity of the points.

However, it may be observed on this argument, that it supposes the *kerioth* not to have been various readings collected from manuscripts, but corrections of the text, made in conformity to an anomalous punctuation. Now, admitting that this erroneous pointing was prior to the *kerioth*, would it not have been more natural to have put a *keri* upon the vowels, than to have placed erroneous consonants in the margin, in conformity with erroneous vowels in the text? If we suppose the *kerioth* to have been the various readings of different copies, all that seems necessary to account for their being often worse than the readings in the text, is to suppose, that those who collected them were very injudicious persons, or had a great reverence for particular copies, the readings of which they on that account preferred, though less eligible in themselves than the readings in the text. Besides, supposing the *kerioth* were made in conformity with the vowels in the text, we must then suppose likewise, that, with respect to the instances where we meet with points in the text without consonants, the transcriber wrote the points, forgetting at the same time to write the consonants, which is very hard to conceive; and where we meet with consonants without points, if the points were there when the *kerioth* were made, why should the points be omitted in the text any more than the consonants? To the

Second class of arguments against the antiquity of the points, which are taken from the Sepher-Torah, the Cabala and Talmud, it is replied,

1st. As to the Sepher-Torah,* it is acknowledged, that the copies of the law which were publicly read in the Jewish synagogues, were always, at least as far back as we can trace them, without points. But to the inference, that the points are of modern invention, because the Jews durst not make any alteration in their law, but would transcribe it just as they found it, it is replied: that from hence it might as well be proved, that the *keri* did originally belong to the law (which is absurd to imagine), as that the points did not. The Jews give two reasons for the Sepher-Torah's being written without points. The one is, that it is thereby capable of more mysterious interpretations; the other, that every one is bound to write over the law once in his life, or at least to get it written for him; and it must be written without any blunder, for one blunder profanes the whole. It is therefore proper it should be written without points, because in such a vast number of points it would be morally impossible to avoid blunders.

Perhaps a third reason may be added for the Sepher-Torah's being written without points, namely, that being written merely for the use of such persons as are well versed in the Hebrew tongue (for it is not to be supposed that any others are employed as public readers in the synagogue), there was no need to write it with the points, they being very capable of reading without them. But as M. T. C. is sufficient for one who is versed in the Roman contractions, while a more unskilful person cannot read unless Marcus Tullius Cicero be wrote at length; so those copies, which were written merely for the use of the learned in the Hebrew language, being written without points, will by no means prove that points were not necessary for, and anciently used by, the more unlearned.

As for the assertion, that the Jews durst not make any alteration in their law, but would transcribe it just as they found it, and that therefore they would have inserted the

* See Buxtorf. de Antiq. Punctor. part i. cap. iv.; and, on the other hand, Capell. Vindiciæ Arcani, lib. i. cap. ii.

points into the Sepher-Torah, if they had then been used originally, or had been invented by Ezra; this supposes, that the same superstitious regard was always paid to the characters and letters in which the law was written, as hath been done since the time of the Masorites of Tiberias; and that the Jews would have scrupled to write out copies without points, for the use of their public readers, who did not need them; which is not probable, even though they had looked on the vowel points to be as authentic as the consonants.

Again, though the modern Sepher-Torah is written without points, yet we cannot be certain how the fact hath always been, particularly how it was in the time of Ezra; for there are no copies of the law now extant, near so ancient as his time. As for the copy in the church of St. Dominick, in Bononia, pretended to be written by Ezra himself, it is in a fair character on a sort of leather, and made up in a roll according to the ancient manner; and it hath the vowel points; but the freshness of the writing, which hath suffered no decay, prevents our believing it to be near so ancient as is pretended. We are not informed, whether the points in this manuscript appear to have been written by a later hand than the consonants; but in many manuscripts, examined by Dr. Kennicott, and those some of the oldest and best, either there are no points at all, or they are evidently a late addition.* The

Second argument against the antiquity of the points was drawn from the Talmud, which makes no mention of them. To which it is replied,† not only that there are books said by Buxtorf to be older than the Talmud, though rejected by Capel as spurious, in which they are expressly mentioned; but likewise that it is highly probable the talmudists, though they make no mention of the points, nevertheless used pointed copies; because all the senses they give of Scripture are agreeable to the present punctuation; whereas if there had

* See Dr. Kennicott's first Dissert. on the Hebrew Text, p. 313—342, passim. And Js. Vossius asserts, that in examining above two thousand Hebrew MSS. he had never met with any pointed, that were above 600 years old; or if the books were older, the points were a late addition; Voss. de Sept. Interp. Translat. cap. 30.

† See Buxtorf. de Antiq. Punctor. part i. cap. vi.; and, in answer to him, Capell. Vindiciæ Arcani, lib. i. cap. vii.; see also above, p. 575.

been no points, it can hardly be thought they would always have given the same sense of words as the points determine them to mean. As to the

Third argument, which is taken from the Cabala; it is replied, that both ancient and modern cabalistical writers have found mysteries in the points, as well as the consonants. For instances of which see "Buxtorf de Antiquitate Punctorum,"* and what Capel saith in confutation of him.† The

Third sort of arguments against the antiquity of the points was drawn from comparing the ancient versions, particularly the Septuagint, with the original; by which, they say, it appears, that the Hebrew copies, which those ancient interpreters used, had no points. But those of the contrary opinion remark,‡

1st. That hereby one argument for the antiquity of the points is greatly confirmed; namely, that without them the sense would be uncertain. It is pretended indeed, that though there are a number of Hebrew words of different significations, whose consonants are the same; yet where these words occur, the context will always determine the true meaning. But we see the contrary in those ancient versions, which are made from copies without points; for they have frequently mistaken the sense by reading with wrong vowels.

2dly. They remark, that if this argument proves any thing, it proves too much; for if the copies we now have of the Septuagint be just transcripts of the original version, we may as easily prove by it, that the Hebrew copy from whence that version was made had no consonants, as that it had no vowels; since it differed as much from our copy in the former as in the latter. This appears in a variety of instances, not only as to the letters, but likewise as to words and sentences.

In the first place, as to letters: there are many instances,

1st. Of the metastoicheiosis, or putting one letter for another. In the fifty-sixth Psalm and the ninth verse, instead of א, their copy must have had נ, in the word בנאדך; for they

* Part i. cap. v.

† Capell. Vindic. Arcani, part i. cap. viii.

‡ See Buxtorf. de Antiq. Punctor. part i. cap. ix. x.; and, on the other side, Capell. Vindiciæ Arcani, lib. i. cap. iv. v.

read it בנגדך, and accordingly render it *ενωπιον σου*. In the sixtieth chapter of Isaiah and the fifteenth verse, for ב they read ז; for עובר *transiens*, עוזר *auxilians*, and accordingly they render it ὁ *βοηθων*. In the thirty-fourth chapter of Ezekiel and the sixteenth verse, for ד they read ר; for אשמיד *disperdam*, אשמיר *custodiam*. In the eighth chapter of the First Book of Samuel and the sixteenth verse, for ה they read ר; for ועשה *et faciet*, they read ועשר, and render it *και αποδεκατωσει*, *et decimabit*. In the sixtieth Psalm and sixth verse, for ט they read ת, for קשט *veritas*, קשת *arcus*. In the sixth chapter of the First Book of Samuel and the eighteenth verse, for ל they read נ; for אבל אבן, λιθος. In the third chapter of Ezekiel and the eighth verse, for מ they read נ; for מצחם *frontem eorum*, נצחם, *νικος αυτων*. On the contrary, in the First Book of Samuel, the twenty-third chapter and the seventh verse, for נ they read מ; for נכר *tradidit*, they read מכר *vendidit*. In the hundred and fourth Psalm and the twelfth verse, for ע they read ק; for עפאים *frondes*, קפאים, and translate it *πετροι*, *rupes*. In the third chapter of Genesis and the fifteenth verse, for פ they read ר; for ישופך *conteret tibi*, they doubtless read ישורך which they render *σου τηρησει*, sc. *κεφαλην*. In the eighth chapter of Isaiah and the twentieth verse, for ר they read ד; for שחר *aurora*, שחד *munus*. Again, in the thirteenth chapter of Zechariah and the first verse, for ר they read מ; for מקור *fons*, מקום *locus*. In the thirty-seventh chapter of Isaiah and the twenty-fifth verse, for ת they read ח; for ושתיתי *et bibi*, they read וישחיתי, as if from שחת *perdidit*; and accordingly they render it *ηρημωσα*.

2dly. There are instances of epenthesis, or letters inserted in words in the copies they translated from, which are not in the present copy. In the twenty-eighth chapter of Proverbs and the twenty-eighth verse, בקום *in surgendo*, they read במקום, and render it *εν τοποις*, *in locis*.

3dly. Metathesis, or changing the place of letters in a word. In the twentieth Psalm and the sixth verse, for נדגל *vexillum erigemus*, they read נגדל, from גדל *gadhal*, *magnus fuit*, and render it *μεγαλυνθησομεθα* (Psalm xix. 5, in the Greek).

4thly. Aphæresis, or leaving out letters. In Isaiah, the fourteenth chapter and thirty-second verse, for מלאכי *nuncii*, they read מלכי *reges*, and render it *βασιλεις εθνων*.

Thus much for a specimen of the difference in letters, between the Hebrew copy, from which the Seventy translated, and ours.

Secondly. There appears also to have been a considerable difference in whole words and sentences. In the second chapter of Job, and the ninth verse, there is a long speech of Job's wife in the Septuagint, which is not in the present Hebrew copy. At the end of the forty-second chapter there is a long genealogical history, which is said to be taken out of a Syriac book. There is a whole Psalm added at the end of the book of Psalms. Twenty verses are left out of the First Book of Samuel, about the middle of the seventeenth chapter.* In the seventeenth of Jeremiah there are four verses wanting in the beginning; and in the thirty-third chapter (chap. xl. in the Greek), thirteen verses at the end. There are also strange transpositions, particularly the thirty-sixth, thirty-seventh, thirty-eighth, and thirty-ninth chapters of Exodus are miserably confused.

So that upon the whole it appears, that if the Septuagint version we now have be genuine, the Hebrew copy it was translated from differed greatly from our present copy, as well in the consonants as the vowels; and therefore it is said, that the argument drawn from this version against the antiquity of the points will either prove too much, or nothing at all.

As to the hypothesis of Dr. Prideaux,† that the points were added to the Hebrew text soon after Ezra's time by the ancient Masorites, and used in their schools in teaching to read the Bible, yet not received into the schools of the rabbies till several hundred years afterward; in support of the former assertion, he alleges the utter impossibility of teaching to read the Hebrew without points, when it was become a dead language; which it is allowed on all hands to have been ever since the captivity.

This opinion, that the points were invented and used by the Masorites soon after the time of Ezra, who is supposed to have settled the true meaning of the Hebrew text, makes their authority very considerable. But if it can be proved, that they were invented a little after Ezra's time, because they

* See Dr. Kennicott's second Dissert. on the Hebrew Text, p. 418—431, 554—558.

† Prideaux's Connect. vol. ii. part i. book v. p. 505, &c.

were necessary to teach the reading of the Hebrew, when it was become a dead language; I see not, but the same argument will prove they were invented in his time; for the Hebrew was a dead language then as well as after.

The latter assertion, that they were not introduced into the schools of the rabbies till some hundred years afterward, is advanced in order to account for the silence of the Talmud, Josephus, and Philo, with most of the ancient Christian fathers, concerning them. Now this silence will indeed prove, that there was no dispute about them in those times; but, whatever presumption it may be, it is no demonstration, that they were not then used even in the schools of the rabbies.

Indeed it was so natural for the inventors of the alphabet to contrive characters for the vowels as well as the consonants, that no small presumption arises from hence, that the present points were coeval with the consonants, unless the *matres lectionis* are supposed to have been the original vowels. To which some add, the use of the points in determining the different meaning of several words, which have the same consonants; particularly in distinguishing the two conjugations of *pihel* and *puhal*, in all the moods and tenses except the infinitive. And this shows the modern points to be at least as ancient as the present structure of Hebrew grammar. However, this controversy not admitting of demonstration on either side of the question, I shall leave you, after considering what hath been said, and what Buxtorf and Capel have further offered, to judge for yourselves, on which side the greatest probability lies; and proceed next to consider the usual divisions of the Hebrew Bible.

Of the general Partitions and Divisions of the Bible.

The general title of the whole is עשרים וארבעה *nesrim vearbangnah*, that is, the twenty-four, because it contains twenty-four books; though, from a passage of Josephus, in his first book against Appion, it appears, that in his time they divided the whole Bible into twenty-two books, corresponding to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet. He saith, we have only twenty-two books, which are deservedly believed to be of divine authority, of which five are the books of Moses.

The prophets, who were the successors of Moses, have written thirteen. The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and documents of life for the use of men.*

At present the Jews make the sacred books to be twenty-four; for they reckon Ezra and Nehemiah as one book, and the twelve minor prophets as one, and the two books of Samuel, of Kings, and of Chronicles, each as one book, which reduces the thirty-nine books, according to our division, to twenty-four. And these twenty-four they distinguish into five of the law, eight of the prophets, and eleven of the hagiographa. The law, or pentateuch, which they call חמשה חומשי תורה *chamishah chumishèi torah,* that is, *quinque quintæ legis,* contains the five books of Moses, each of which is called by the word with which it begins, or the most considerable near the beginning, as *Bereshith, Shemoth,* &c. The prophets, in Hebrew נביאים *nebhiim,* are distinguished into נביאים ראשונים *nebhiim rishonim,* or former prophets, which are Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings; and the נביאים אחרונים *nebhiim acharonim,* or the latter prophets, which are again distinguished into the *majores,* which are Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel; and the twelve *minores,* namely, Hosea, Joel, &c., which are all reckoned one book.

The *hagiographa,* or ספר כתובים *sepher chetubbim,* contain Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. But in some books, as Athias's and Plantin's editions, the חמש מגילת *chamesh megillath,* that is, the books of Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, are placed just

* Joseph. contra Appion. lib. i. sect. viii. tom. ii. p. 441, edit. Haverc. This passage of Josephus is much insisted on by Mr. Whiston and some others, to disprove the divine authority of the book of Canticles. We have now, they say, five books in our Bibles, which answer to this title, Hymns to God, and Documents of Life for the use of Men; namely, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles; whereas it is plain, that in Josephus's time there were but four. Therefore the book of Canticles, they conceive, hath been added since. See Mr. Whiston's Supplement to his Essay toward restoring the true text of the Old Testament, proving that the Canticles is not a sacred book, printed 1723; and, on the other side, a Defence of the Canon of the Old Testament, in answer to Mr. Whiston, by William Itchinger, M. A. 1723.

after the Pentateuch; and then the hagiographa contain only Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. The reason why the Jews divide them in this manner is, that they might have no occasion to carry the whole Bible to their synagogue, but only the Pentateuch and those five books which are read at different feasts, namely, Canticles at the passover, Ruth at the pentecost, Lamentations at the fast which is kept in July in commemoration of the burning of the temple, Ecclesiastes at the feast of tabernacles, and Esther at the feast of purim. This last book is written in a little roll by itself, and called מגילת אסתר *megillath Esther*, from גלל *galal, volvit*.*

The division of the Bible into these three parts, the law, the prophets, and the hagiographa, seems to be referred to in the following passage of St. Luke: "All things must be fulfilled, which are written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me;" chap. xxiv. 44. As the book of Psalms stood first in the hagiographa, or the third division, that whole division was commonly called the Psalms, as the whole book of Genesis is named by the first word in it, and so several other books. This enumeration, therefore, the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, includes the whole Bible.

On the same principle Dr. Lightfoot accounts for a supposed false citation in St. Matthew, chap. xxvii. 9, 10, "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy, the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value, and gave them for the potters' field." The passage here cited is not in Jeremiah, but in Zechariah. Accordingly Beza styles this difficulty, "Nodus, qui vetustissimos quosque interpretes torsit." St. Austin supposes it to be *αμαρτημα μνημονικον*, a slip of St. Matthew's memory, which is by no means to be admitted, if we allow that he wrote by the special guidance of the Spirit of God. Dr. Wall, observing that Dr. Mill supposes it to be a *lapsus calami* of St. Matthew, thinks it more likely that the Greek translator of his Gospel should have been thus mistaken than the evangelist himself;

* See, on this subject, Buxtorf. Tiberias, cap. xi.

and if so, saith he, it is pity somebody did not do here as St. Jerome did in a similar difficulty relating to "Zacharias, the son of Barachias," who is said to have been "slain between the temple and the altar;" namely, consult the Hebrew copy of St. Matthew's Gospel before it was lost.* Indeed St. Jerome saith, with respect to the present difficulty, that a Nazarene Jew showed him a book, accounted an apocryphal book of the prophet Jeremiah, where this passage is expressed verbatim.†

The learned Joseph Mede conceives, that these words, as well as several passages which now stand in the book of Zechariah, were originally spoken by Jeremiah, but have been misplaced through the unskilfulness of the persons who collected their prophecies.‡

However, Dr. Lightfoot, by testimonies from the rabbies, shows us, that Jeremiah did anciently stand first in the book of the Prophets. And hence he came to be mentioned before all the rest in the following passage of St. Matthew, "Some say that thou art John the Baptist, some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets;" chap. xvi. 14. Accordingly, as the whole hagiographa is called the Psalms, from the Psalms being the first book, so the whole volume of the Prophets is for the same reason called Jeremiah.§

There is yet another, and perhaps more probable, conjecture of Bishop Hall, who imagines, that Zechariah having been written contractedly Ζριου, was by some transcriber mistaken for Ιριου.

Others after all suppose, that the name of the prophet is an erroneous marginal addition, now crept into the text, since the Syriac version only saith, "It was spoken by the prophet," without mentioning his name.

I shall conclude the whole with an account of the most considerable editions of the Bible. I mean those which may be called pompous editions; for the plain, or the mere editions of the Hebrew text, are too numerous for our attempting a de-

* See Dr. Wall's Critical Notes on the New Testament, on Matt. xxiii. 35.

† See Dr. Wall on Matt. xxvii. 9, 10.

‡ Mede's Works, book iv. epist. xxxi. p. 786, London, 1677.

§ Lightfoot's Horæ Hebraicæ, on Matt. xxvii. 9.

tail of them. By the pompous editions, otherwise called Opera Biblica, I intend those which contain not only the sacred text, but likewise some commentaries, or versions, joined with it; and they are chiefly these four, the Biblia Complutensia, Biblia Regia, Biblia Parisiensia, and Biblia Polyglotta.

The Biblia Complutensia, so called from Complutum in Spain, where the work was printed, is contained in one volume folio. It was published under the care of Cardinal Ximenes, anno 1514, containing the Old Testament in Hebrew, the vulgar Latin, the Targum of Onkelos on the Pentateuch, and the Septuagint version, with the Latin translation of both; also the New Testament in Greek and Latin.

The Biblia Regia, so called from Philip II. of Spain, at whose charge the work was executed, contains eight volumes, printed at Antwerp, anno dom. 1571, with a better letter and paper than the former. Arias Montanus had the greatest share in this work, which contains several things more than the Complutensian, namely, the Chaldee Paraphrase on all the Old Testament, with a Latin version of it; the interlineary version of the New Testament; and also the New Testamēnt in Syriac, expressed both in Hebrew and Syriac characters.

The Biblia Parisiensia, in ten volumes, was printed at Paris, anno dom. 1645, at the charge of a private man, Michael de Jay, and therefore it is also called Jay's Bible. It was done under the direction and care of Dr. Gabriel Sionita, professor of the Oriental languages at Paris, of Johannes Morinus, and Abraham Ecchellensis.

It exceeds the Biblia Regia both in paper and in print; it hath, besides all which that contains, the Pentateuch in Samaritan, all the Old Testament in Syriac, and both Testaments in Arabic.

The Anglicanum opus Biblicum, called the Polyglot, was printed chiefly under the care of Dr. Bryan Walton, in six volumes, at London, 1657. This contains several things which Jay's Bible hath not. It has Arias Montanus's interlineary version, the Septuagint from the Vatican and Alexandrian copies, which are supposed to be the best; the old Vulgate Latin translation of the Septuagint, which alone, he

tells you, is that which the Latin church used four hundred years after the apostles. It has the Persic Pentateuch in the Persic character; the Psalms, Canticles, and New Testament in the Ethiopic; the Jerusalem Targum, the Chaldee Paraphrase of Jonathan,* &c.

Dr. Edmund Castell, Arabic professor at Cambridge, published a Lexicon for the use of Walton's Polyglot, in two volumes folio, which generally goes with it, making in all eight volumes.

* See the Preface to the London Polyglot.

INDEX OF TEXTS

ILLUSTRATED OR EXPLAINED.

GENESIS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page
i.	5	402, 403
	26—28	101
	29, 30	209, 210, note
ii.	3	432, 433
	2, 3	445, 446
	7	553
iii.	21	208, 209
iv.	3	410
	4	101, 102
	13, 14	2, 3
	15	3, 4
	23, 24	4, 5
vii.	2	102, 103
	6, 11	461
viii.	21	446
ix.	3	209, 210, note
	22—25	7—9
x.	8, 9	6
	21	70
xi.	1, 6, 7, 9	559—561
xiv.	13	71
xv.	5	251
xxi.	9, &c.	9, 10
	33	392
xxxi.	39	224
xxxv.	2	91
xxxviii.	24	10, 11
xlix.	7	10, 197, 198
	10	51—54
	26	285

EXODUS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page
iii.	5	165
	6	165
	16	12
	21	338
iv.	29	12
v.	14	12
xii.	2	453
	5	460—462
	6	459, 460
	8, 11, 46	468—471
	9	467
	10	471
	22	465, 466
	22, 23	472
	35, 36	338
	48	90
xvi.	23—26	433, 434
xx.	8	438, 439
	24	395
xxi.	1—6	533, 534
xxiii.	16	496, 497
xxiv.	1, 9, 14	25
	5	131, 132
xxvi.	23	339
xxvii.	5	343
	9	341
xxviii.	6	154, 155
	8	155
	9—12	155
	15	156
	30	158—162
	31—34	150—154
	36—38	156—158
	40	146—148
	41	170
	42	145, 146
xxix.	20	169

Chap.	Ver.	Page
xxix.	21	152, 153
	22	168
	29, 30	143
xxx.	12—16	82—84
	23—25	141
	30	130
	31—33	142
xxxi.	14	437, 438
	16, 17	98
xxxiv.	22	509
xxxv.	3	441
xxxvi.	33	339
xxxviii.	4	343
	8	344
xxxix.	27	147

LEVITICUS.

v.	6—8	227
	15, 16	18, 19
x.	1, 2	134
	17	219
xvi.	4	147
	8	518—521
	14, 15	524, 525
	29	513, 514
xvii.	12, 15	98
xxi.	10—12	171—176
	13, 14	170, 171
xxiii.	3	365
	11	481, 482
	15, 16	483
	24	508
	40	491—494
xxv.	2	528, 529
	3, 4	529—531
	10, 11	539, 540
	45	97
xxvii.	29	39, 40

NUMBERS.

iv.	3, 23, 43	186, 187
vi.	3, 4	290
	9—12	289
viii.	10	199
	11	198, 199
	24, 25	186, 187
x.	4	25
	35, 36	15
xi.	16	25
	25	25
xiii.	8, 16	20, 21
	32	21
xiv.	41, 42	15
xxi.	14	14
xxiv.	24	72
xxv.	12, 13	135
xxvii.	20	15
xxviii.	11, 19, 27	494
	15	505
xxix.	1	506
	36	494, 495
xxxii.	2	25
xxxv.	4, 5	201, 202

DEUTERONOMY.

v.	12	442—444
xii.	13, 14	391, 395
xiv.	21	97
	23	205
xv.	1—3	532, 533
xvi.	8	454
	18	24
	21	391
xvii.	9	30
	14 to the end	111—119
	17	59
xviii.	15	22
xxiii.	1, &c.	96, 97
xxxii.	8	562
xxxiii.	5	19, 20
	16	285
xxxiv.	10	257

JOSHUA.

v.	14, 15	165
vi.	4	537, 538
xxiv.	26	382, 383

JUDGES.

viii.	14	23
xi.	5, 6	23
	30—40	31—41

1 SAMUEL.

i.	1, 19	263
ii.	27, et seq.	137
iii.	2—4	241
viii.	5—7	111
	7	16
ix.	9	235, 236
x.	1	121
	5	262

Chap. Ver. Page
x. 6, 7. 133
xii. 12. 16
xvi. 23. . . . . 243, 244
xvii. 17, 18. 59

2 SAMUEL.
viii. 17. . . . . 135, 136
x. 4, 5. 146
xii. 30. . . . . 124, 125
xiv. 26. . . . . 286—288
xxiv. 56, 57
24. 353

1 KINGS.
i. 39. 121
xii. 28, 29. . . . . 349, 350

2 KINGS.
iii. 12, 13, 15. 243
iv. 29. . . . . 422, 423
v. . . . . 104—107
xvi. 18. 439
xx. 9—11. . . . . 404, 405
xxiv. 10, et seq. 43, 44

1 CHRONICLES.
v. 17. 87
ix. 1. 87
xv. 16. . . . . 192, 193
xxi. 25. 353
xxii. 14. 354
xxiii. 4. . . . . 196, 197
xxvi. 20. 195
xxviii. 11—13. . . . . 181, 182
xxix. 4, 6, 7. 354
15. 71

2 CHRONICLES.
v. 13. 191
xii. 15. 86

EZRA.
i. 2. 355
ii. 65. 188
vi. 17. 45
viii. 35. 45

NEHEMIAH.
ii. 1. 453
6. 46
vii. 64, 65. . . . . 88, 89

Chap. Ver. Page
vii. 67. 188
viii. 15. 492
xiii. 1—3. . . . . 96, 97
24. 564

ESTHER.
ix. 20—ult. . . . . 544—548

JOB.
i. 6. 431

PSALMS.
ii. 12. 125
xl. 6. . . . . 211, 534, 535
xlv. 1. 267
7. 144
10. 95
l. 8—14. 211
li. 8, 10—12. . . . . 242, 243
16. 211
lv. 17. 408
lxxiv. 8. 364
lxxx. 1. . . . . 13, 351
lxxxi. 3. 502
lxxxix. 20. 121
xcviii. 6. 188
xcix. 1. . . . . 13, 351
civ. 15. 152
cx. 4. 130
cxxxiii. 2. . . . . 122, 151

ISAIAH.
iv. 5. 365
xx. 2, 3. . . . . 249—253
xxx. 29. 191
xxxiii. 18. 267
xliv. 28. 45
xlv. 1—4. 45
liii. 4, 12. 219
lviii. 5. . . . . 513, 514
lxi. 1, 2. 542

JEREMIAH.
vii. 22. . . . . 210—214
xiii. 4, 5. . . . . 249—253
xxv. 15—29. 250
xxvii. 3. 250
xxviii. 10. 253
xxxv. 6, 7. . . . . 294, 295
xxxvi. 4, 32. 267

Chap. Ver. Page

LAMENTATIONS.
ii. 8.....359

EZEKIEL.
iii. 17.....263
iv. .....249—253
xii. 6.....249
xvi. 10.....340

DANIEL.
iii. 15.....405
iv. 19.....405
ix. 24.....411

HOSEA.
i. 2.....249, 251

JOEL.
ii. 28.....244

AMOS.
ii. 11.....290

ZECHARIAH.
vi. 12.....524, 525

MATTHEW.
ii. 23.....292
iii. 15.....139
iv. 15.....78
vi. 29.....126
x. 10.....468, 469
9.....149
xii. 40.....530
xvi. 14.....305
21.....183
xvii. 24—26.....57, 58
xxiii. 2, 3.....272
5.....308—312
7—9.....281—283
15.....95
34.....265
xxiv. 20.....531
xxvi. 17.....478
65.....175
xxviii. 1.....401

MARK.
i. 22.....270
iii. 6.....327—330
vi. 8.....469
xiii. 1.....358
xiv. 12.....478
xv. 25.....406

LUKE.
i. 5, 9, 11.....499
ii. 2.....61, 62
46.....378
iii. 4—6.....398
23.....500
iv. 20.....375
vi. 1.....428, 429
12.....379
vii. 28.....241
ix. 3.....469
x. 1, 4.....423, 424
xi. 44.....268, 269
xiv. 26.....95
xvi. 22.....427
xix. 2.....64
xxi. 5.....358, 362

JOHN.
ii. 6.....425, 426
20.....361
iii. 10.....94
iv. 9.....319
v. 2.....359
2—4.....385—389
viii. 20.....361
ix. 22.....390
x. 22.....357, 548—550
23.....359
xii. 20.....75
42.....390
xiii. 1, 2.....456, 457
23.....427
29.....456
xiv. 23.....234
xvi. 2.....390
xviii. 28.....458
xix. 14.....406, 458
xx. 16.....284

ACTS.
i. 12.....443
ii. 1.....484—486, 488
5.....110, 451
10.....110
iii. 11.....359

Chap. Ver. Page

vi. 1....73
2....421
9....366—368
viii. 26, et seq....108, 109
ix. 23—29....75
x. 2....107, 108
xi. 19, 20....75
xiii. 2....199
14, 15....375
43....89
xiv. 23....200
xv. 21....443
xvi. 1....74
13....379
xix. 8—10....378, 379
10....74
xxii. 3....377
xxiii. 5....163
9....269
xxvii. 9....510—512
xxviii. 11....512

ROMANS.

i. 1....199
14....265
iii. 25....347
v. 7, 8....297
xiii. 7....63

1 CORINTHIANS.

i. 20....265
v. 7....472—477
viii. 10....231
x. 2....91
xi. 4....166
5....238
21....420
xiii. 12....345
xiv. 32....256

2 CORINTHIANS.

v. 21....224
xi. 22....73

GALATIANS.

iii. 28....67

Chap. Ver. Page

EPHESIANS.

ii. 13, 14....360
14....99
v. 14....506, 507

PHILIPPIANS.

iii. 5....73

COLOSSIANS.

ii. 18, 23....325

1 TIMOTHY.

iii. 13....187

HEBREWS.

vii. 14....88
ix. 3, 4....351, 352
7....523
x. 4....18
5....534, 535
6....224
xi. 4....212
32....36—39
40....38, 39
xii. 23....449
xiii. 11, 12....226
15....229

JAMES.

ii. 2....126
2—4....376, 377

1 PETER.

i. 12....348

2 PETER.

i. 16—19....259—261
21....242, 253, 255

JUDE.

12....421

REVELATION.

xi. 2....99
xvi. 15....195
xvii. 5....157, 158
xviii. 14....126

INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS

AND PHRASES EXPLAINED.

	Page
א	
אבב	453
אברהם	20
אדם	556
אדמה	2
אורים	158
אות	4
אזנים	535
אחש-ורוש	546, 547
איל מלאים	168, 169
אנשי מעמיד	206, 207
ארגמן	154, 155
ארחת	418
ארץ	2
אשוריית	568
אשל	392
ב	
בבל	558
בד	147
בגבג	89
בטלנים	368
בין הערבים	459
בית-רבן / בית-רבנין	377
במראת	345
בן-גר / בן-גרה	89
בן-שנה / בן-שש מאות	461
בצאת השנה	496
בת	426
בת-קול	258—260
ג	
גבעת	262
גבר	6
גדול	8
גדלים	310
גמרא	277
ד	
דבר	78
דרשנים	277
ה	
הבל	557
החפץ ימלא אתי-דו	170
הוד	15
הוה	556
הושע	20, 21
הפטריית	371
השתחויתי	106
ו	
ו used disjunctively	30, 33, 34, 54
ויכל	445
ז	
זהב	353
זכרון תרועה	508
זקנים	12
זרק	153
ח	
חג	493
חדש	412
חורים	126
חזה	235
חזן	369, 370
חטאת	223, 224
חיל	359

Page

חכם . 264,265
חלב . 101,102
חליל . . . 191
חסידים . 296,297
חצוצרת . 188,190
חק . . . 41
חרסת . 470,471
חשוחים . . . 126

ט

טורני . . . 378

י

יבל . 537,538
יהשע . . 20,21
ימא . . . 516
יפרע . 171,172
ישרון . . 19,20

כ

כהן . 129,130
כלי . 337,338
כנור . . . 192
כסף . . . 353
כרת . 480,481
כרוב . 348,349
כרית . 534,535
כרכוב . . . 343

ל

להתיחש . . . 86
לי . . . 26
לסרבה . . . 569
לפני . . . 525
לתנות לבת . . . 33

מ

מדרש . . . 277
מוסך השבת . . . 439
מועדה . . . 364
מות יומת . . 39,40
מחלקות . . . 181
מחקק . . . 52
מכבי . . 49,50
מסר . . . 274

Page

מקץ ימים . 409,410
מקרא . 277,365
משה . . . 557
משמרות . . . 181
משנה 116,117,277
משפט . . . 118
משקל . . . 124
משררות . . . 188
משתה . 418,419

נ

נא . . . 467
נביא . 234—236
נבל . . . 192
נוח . . . 446
נזה . . . 153
נזר 124,285,286
נזיר . 285,286
נסן . 453,454
נערים . 131,132
נשא . . . 219

ס

סגן . . . 177
סף . 465,466
ספר . . . 266
סרני . . . 378

ע

עבר . . 78,79
עבריים . . 70—73
עולות . . . 221
עזאזל . 518—521
עטרת מלכם . . . 125
על-פני . . . 525
עץ הדר / עץ עבת . . 491
עצרת . 454,489
ערב / ערב-בקר . . 403

פ

פי מדותו . 122,151
פך . . . 121
פלג . . . 557

	Page
רגליו	52
רמש	209, note
ש	
שאל	338
שבט	51, 52
שבע	411
שה	460
שהם	155
שטרים	12, 24, 196, 270
שלה	52, 53
שליח צבור	369
שעה	405
שפטים	196, 197
שפר	188
שפרות היבלים	537, 538
שש	147, 148
שת	556
ת	
תוף	189
תחש	340
תכלת	150
תמים	158
תמר	491
תנה	33
תנופה	198
תפלין	308
תקופת השנה	509
תרומה	198
תשבץ	147

	Page
פ:ים	152
פסח, פסחא	452, 453
פרושים	301
פרקים	191
פרשית	370
פתיל	310
צ	
ציץ	157
ציצית	310
צלצל	192, 193
צמה	524, 525
צפים	263
צר	137
ק	
קדש	432
קהל	97
קטן	8
קין	556
קלעים	341
קצץ	43, 44
קראים	298
קרן	128
ר	
ראה	234—236
רב, רבי, רבן	283, 284
רבים	298

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

AND PHRASES EXPLAINED.

Page

A

αγαθος 297
αγαπαις . . . . 420—422
αμαρτια 224
αναθηματα 323
αναθεματιζω 79
αποκρινομαι 78
αποστολοι 265
αποφραδες 433
αρτον εσθιωσιν . . . 79
αρχισυναγωγος . . . 369
αρχιτελωναι . . . 64, 65
αστειος τῳ Θεῳ . . . 80

B

βεβαιοτερον . . 259, 260
Βηθεσδα . . . 385, 386
βιβλος 78

Γ

γαζοφυλακιον 361
γιγας 6
γενεων αρχαιων . 443, note
γραμματεις του μερους των Φαρισαιων } 269, 270

Δ

δειπνου γενομενου . . 458
δι' εσοπτρου 345
διδραχμα 57, 58

E

εγκαινια 548
εις, μια, εν 78

Page

εις τι 81
ἑλληνες } ἑλληνισται } . . . 74, 75
εν ᾗ 351, 352
εξεληλοθυτας εκ της οσφυος του Αβρααμ } 79
εξομολογειν 78
επιφωσκουση 401
εσκηνωσεν εν ἡμιν . . 498
ἑτερον σωμα . . 304, 305
εφημερια . . . 181, 182

Z

ζυλοφορια 549

Θ

θεοκρατια 13
θεραπευται 321
θυσιας 323

I

ιδειν θανατον 79
ἱλαστηριον 347
Ιωνια 557

K

καθαρισμος 425
καθηγητης 283
κατα καιρον 386
κατοικουντες } κατοικησις } . . . 451
κολυμβηθρα 385
κραβαττος . . . 309, 310

Page

Λ

λαμπρος 126
λιβερτινος 367

Μ

μετρηται 425
μητε ῥαβδους μητε ῥαβδον . . . 469

Ν

νηστεια 510, 511
νομικοι 268, 269
νομοδιδασκαλοι . 268, 269
νυχθημερον 403

Ο

οικουμενη 62
ὁλοκαυστα 221

Π

πασχα 452, 453
πεντηκοστη 488
περαν 78
Πηλουσια 558
πρακτορες 24
πρασιαι πρασιαι . . . 80
προβατικη 385
προλαμβανει 420
προσελυτοι 89
προσκυνεω 81
προσευχη . . . 379, 380
προσωποληψια . . . 376
πρωτη ἡμερα των αζυμων 478

Ρ

ῥημα 78

Σ

σαββατον 428
σαββατον δευτεροπρωτον . . 428, 429
σαββατον σαββατων . 516
σαββατω (εν) 531
σπλαγχνιζομαι . . . 79
συνχρωνται 319
συμπληρουσθα . . . 484
συναγωγη 376
σχολη 378, 379
στοαι 359

Τ

τελειος 39
τεγειοω 39
τελος 63, 64
τελωναι 63, 64
τρεις ἡμερας και τρεις νυκτας . . 530
Τυραννος 378

Υ

ὑπηρετης 370
ὑποτασσεται 256

Φ

φερομενοι 255
φορος 63
φυλακτηρια 308

Χ

χαριτοω 79
χειροθεσια 200
χειροτονια 200

Ω

ωκοδομηθη 361

INDEX.

A.

AARON, the high-priesthood allotted to him and his family, 131, 132; the manner in which it was limited to them, 134.

Abarbanel, his opinion about the antiquity of the Hebrew language, 554.

Abel, what his sacrifice consisted of, 101.

Abraham, the Chaldee language was that of his country; he afterward learnt the Hebrew by dwelling among the Canaanites, 563.

Absalom, whether he was a Nazarite or not, 286; the prodigious weight of his hair considered, 287.

Adam, the father of all mankind; special honours paid to him, 1.

Ahasuerus, king of Persia, the Jews dispersed in his reign; a question among the learned who this king Ahasuerus was; his kindness to the Jews owing to queen Esther, 546; this name a common appellation of the kings of Persia, *ibid.*

Ahaz, the shadow goes back ten degrees on his sun-dial, 404; questioned whether the miracle was wrought on the sun itself, or only on the dial, 404, 405.

Alexander the Great enters Jerusalem in a friendly manner, 47; becomes kindly disposed toward the Jews, 531.

Alexander Jannæus advises his wife on his death-bed to seek the favour of the Pharisees, 302; her great success in so doing, 303.

Angels, the law revealed by their ministry, 262.

Animal food, arguments to prove it was not used before the deluge, 101; arguments on the contrary side, *ibid.*

Anointing, whether all the kings of the Hebrews were anointed, 119; the manner of anointing, 122; the custom of anointing very ancient, 123; the Jewish priests anointed to their office, 139.

Antediluvians, whether they used animal food, 100—103; the absurdity of those writers who would compute their ages, not by solar years, but by months, 413.

Antiochus Epiphanes, his impious behaviour at Jerusalem, 48; his decree against the Jews, 49; plundered and profaned the temple, 356; forbad the reading of the law in the synagogues, 371.

Aristocracy, the supreme government in the nobles, 23, note; that government subsists in Venice and Holland, *ibid.*

Ark of the testimony, its description and use, 346; the two tables of the law writ by God, and deposited in it, 347; also the pot of manna and Aaron's rod, 351.

Asaph and others, masters of music in David's time, 189.

Assideans, their character, 296; not a distinct sect from the pious Jews, *ibid.*

Assyrian captivity of the ten tribes began by Tiglath-pileser, 42; completed by Salmanassar, *ibid.*

Attica, that country divided into ten tribes, 181; how the senate was chosen, *ibid.*

Augustus, reduced Judea into the form of a Roman province, 60; a difficulty in his time about taxing considered, 61.

"*Awake* thou that sleepest," what critics say of that passage, 506.

B.

Babel, the confusion of languages there, 559; several opinions about the manner of this confusion, *ibid.*; it appears to be the immediate hand of God, 561; how many languages arose from this confusion, 562.

Babylonish captivity of the tribe of Judah, began in Jehoiakim's reign, 43; afterward the king, nobles, and ten thousand carried captive, *ibid.*

Bacchanalia, the heathens supposed to have borrowed their festivity from the feast of tabernacles, 493; a wild scene of mirth acted in the court of the temple, 495.

Barefoot, to be so in public worship a sign of reverence, 165.

Bath-kol, what the Jewish rabbies mean by these words, 258; a sort of divination among the Jews, 259.

Bells, on the high-priest's garment, their size and number, 151.

Bethesda, that pool near the temple, famous for its miraculous cures, 385; the etymology of the word, *ibid.*; the great virtue of these waters, 386; its healing virtue miraculous, 388; when it had this virtue, *ibid.*; a type of the fulfilment of Zechariah's prophecy, *ibid.*

Bible, Jewish, written in the Hebrew language, 565; in what character, whether Hebrew or Samaritan, 566; whether with points or without points, 572—592; the general divisions of the Bible, 592; how the learned account for a supposed false citation, 594; the most considerable editions of the Hebrew Bible, 595.

Biblia Complutensia, an edition of the Hebrew Bible, printed at Complutum in Spain, 595.

Biblia Regia, an edition printed at Antwerp, so called from Philip II. of Spain, 596.

Biblia Parisiensia, an edition printed at Paris, 596.

Biblia Anglicana, the Polyglot, printed at London, 596; makes eight volumes with Castell's Lexicon, *ibid.*

Bishops and archbishops, hint of appointing them supposed to be taken from the Jewish priests, 180.

Blackwall, his observations on the style of the New Testament, 82.

Breeches, those worn by the high-priest described, 145, 146.

Burnt-offerings, accounted the most excellent sacrifices, 222; entirely consumed by fire, *ibid.*; their grand use to direct to Christ, the true atoning sacrifice, 223.

Buxtorf, his arguments for the antiquity of the Hebrew points, 575, 576; his answers to Capel's arguments against the antiquity of the points, 584—591.

C.

Cabalists, a sort of mystical doctors, 276; pretended to discover a mystery in the sacred text, 277; and a sense never intended by the authors, *ibid.*

Cain, banished for the murder of his brother Abel, 2; why punished with banishment and not with death, 3; various opinions about Cain's mark, *ibid.*

Caleb and Joshua only bring a good report of Canaan, 21.

Canaan, a curse denounced on him by Noah, 6; why the curse was on Canaan and not on Ham, 8; what meant by his being "a servant of servants," 9.

Canaan, those who brought a bad report of it died by the plague, 22.

Canaanites, the Hebrew was their language, 563, 564; the names of their cities probably of that language, *ibid.*

Capel, his arguments against the antiquity of the Hebrew points, 577.

Captivity of the Hebrew nation, 42; the Assyrian captivity that of the ten tribes, *ibid.*; the Babylonish captivity was that of Judah and Benjamin only, 43; their several periods, *ibid.*

Cherethites and Pelethites, what they were, 127.

Cherubim, their form and size in the ark, 348—350.

Chinese claim the honour of the original language, 555.

Christ, the great Messiah, typified by the paschal lamb, 472; in what respects a lamb typifies our Lord, 473; the sufferings and death of Christ typified by the paschal lamb, 474; the consequences of Christ's death also typified, *ibid.*; the ways and means of having an interest in Christ, represented by lively emblems in the passover, 475.

Christ called a Nazarene or Nazarite, 291—293.

Christ's "nativity," the day not fixed upon till the fourth century, 498; what ground for fixing it to the end of December, 499; arguments against its being in winter, *ibid.*; not improbable that it was at the feast of tabernacles, 500.

Cities "of refuge," appointed for those guilty of involuntary homicide, 201; the Latin and Hebrew etymology considered, 397; the sacred groves ancient places of refuge, *ibid.*; Mr. Jones's opinion upon that matter, *ibid.*; six cities of the Levites appointed for cities of refuge, *ibid.*; not sanctuaries for wilful murderers or atrocious crimes, *ibid.*; at every cross leading to these cities was an inscription, 398.

Consecration, the Jewish priests consecrated to their office, 138.

Cornelius, the centurion, not a Jewish proselyte, 107.

Coronation, the second ceremony at the inauguration of the kings of Israel, 123.

Crown of gold, worn by the high-priest, described, 156, 157.

Cymbal, what kind of instrument it was, 192.

Cyrus, king of Persia, restores the Jews to their own land, 44.

D.

Dan, a tribe given to idolatry, 136.

Daniel not admitted among the prophets by the Talmudists, 239; his clear prophecy of the Messiah's coming the cause of it, 240.

David, what was his sin in numbering the people, 57.

Days, how the Hebrews distinguished them, 401; at what time their days begun, *ibid.*; their sacred days from even to even, *ibid.*; a passage out of the evangelist Matthew considered, *ibid.*; the beginning of the natural day supposed to be by some in the evening, 402; by others from the first production of light, 403; the day divided into hours, 404; and into twelve parts, *ibid.*

Dedication, the feast of, by whom instituted, 548; mentioned by Josephus as a feast much regarded, *ibid.*; the circumstance of Christ's walking in the temple at this feast considered, 549.

Dissenters, inferences by Dr. Prideaux proposed to their consideration, 372; these examined, 373—375.

Divination, adopted from the Heathens, 260; the manner in which the Christians used it, 261.

Dreams and visions, the manner of revelation to the prophets, 244.

E.

Ears, "mine ears hast thou opened," these words considered, 534.
East, the heathen idolaters worshipped towards the East, 335.
Eber, his character, 68; the Hebrews take their name from him, *ibid.*
Elders of Israel in Egypt, 12; and also in Canaan, 23; seventy, whether a perpetual or temporary institution, 25.
Eleazar, why his family was deprived of the priesthood, 136.
Elisha, the story of his passion considered, 243.
Ellenes and *Ellenistai*, these words considered, 75.
Ephod, a garment worn by the high-priest, 154; a description of it, 155.
Essenes, ascribe all things to fate and the stars, 304; no notice taken of them in Scripture, 320; a sect among the Jews, *ibid.*; the Jewish writers speak of them, *ibid.*; the etymology of the name, *ibid.*; their austere way of life, 321, 322; their great veneration for the books of Moses, 323.
Ethiopians, a tradition among them about the queen of Sheba, 109; and about the eunuch baptized by Philip, *ibid.*
Evangelists and apostles, their writings criticised upon as to style, 82—86.
Eunuch of Ethiopia, not a proselyte of the gate, 108; from whence he came, 109.
Excommunicated persons not excluded from the temple, 390; the modern excommunication of Popery censured, *ibid.*
Expiation, the day of, an annual fast, 510; the day of atonement, expiatory sacrifices being offered thereon, 515; reasons assigned by the Jews for fixing this feast to the tenth of the month Tizri, *ibid.*; this day to be kept with the religious regard of a sabbath, 517; the victims offered were fifteen in number, *ibid.*; the two goats, one of them to be sacrificed, *ibid.*; the rites on this day performed by the high-priest, 521; the grand peculiarity of this day, the priest entering into the holy of holies, 522; whether he entered in only once, *ibid.*; the service performed by him in the sanctuary, 523; the blood ordered to be sprinkled eastward, 524; the spiritual meaning of the rites used on this day, 525; the expiatory sacrifices typical of the true expiation made by Christ, 525, 526.
Ezra restores the worship of God after the captivity, 46; some are of opinion that the Hebrew points were added by him, 572.

F.

Fast, mentioned in St. Paul's voyage, what fast is there referred to, 510—512.
Fasting, instances of this religious practice, 513, 514.
Fasts and Festivals, the Jewish calendar crowded with them, 550.
Feasts, Jewish, an account of them, 418; the ceremonies used at them, 422—426; the table gesture used at these feasts, 427.
Feasts, weekly, monthly, and annual, 448; the three annual were the passover, pentecost, and tabernacles, *ibid.*; at each of these the males were to appear every year at the national altar, *ibid.*; the design of this institution, *ibid.*; the reasons assigned for the women being exempted, 449; two difficulties attending this law, 450; the one, how Jerusalem could contain them, answered, *ibid.*; the other, how their towns and their houses could be left unguarded, 451.
Fringes, used by the Pharisees, their form and use, 309—311.

G.

Gaulonites, a political faction raised by Judas of Galilee, 327.
Garments of the Jewish priests, 145—162; only worn when they officiated, 162; they were provided at the expense of the people, 163; what became of them when left off, 164; nothing worn on the hands and

feet of the priests when in their ministrations, *ibid.*; were supposed to have a moral and typical signification, 166.

Genealogies of the Hebrews, 86; were destroyed by Herod, 87; the genealogies of Christ, from whence copied, 88; their genealogical tables long since lost, 88, 89; their being lost an argument that the Messiah is come, *ibid.*

Gentiles, an account of their outer court, 99.

Gnazazel, a name given to the scape-goat, 518; critical remarks upon that name, 518—521.

Goats, two, received from the congregation, and set before the tabernacle, 517; one to be sacrificed, and the other to be sent alive into the wilderness, *ibid.*; both the goats typical of Christ, 521.

God may be said to be the king of the Jews, as to their civil government, 13; he gave them laws, *ibid.*; proclaimed peace and war, 14; divided their marches, *ibid.*; appointed all their officers of state, 15.

Government, the patriarchal form thereof, 1; cannot subsist without an executive power, *ibid.*; civil government supposed to be in the first ages, 2.

Gradus Mosaicus, the import of these words, 256, 257.

Greeks, in Scripture, include the whole Heathen world, 67; an account of them, 75.

Groves and "high places," religious worship forbid there, 391; idolatrous worship performed there, 392; for what end Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, *ibid.*; the origin of planting sacred groves, *ibid.*; the custom of burying the dead under trees considered, 393; groves usually planted on the tops of hills, 394.

H.

Hagar, with Ishmael, flee from Abraham's family, 9.

Ham, his crime against his father Noah, 7; why the curse not denounced on Ham, but on Canaan his son, 8.

Haman, why he cast lots for fixing the day for the massacre of the Jews, 547; the lot over-ruled by the God of Israel for defeating the conspiracy, 548.

Hammond, his opinion about the pool of Bethesda rejected, 386, 387.

Hands (holding up), at elections, a custom derived from the Athenians, 200.

Hart, Vander, his opinion about Ham's crime, 7.

Hebraisms, many of them in the New Testament, 77—82.

Hebrew commonwealth, its form patriarchal and special, 1; its government considered, 11; distinguished into four periods, *ibid.*; the form of their government while in Egypt, *ibid.*; a theocracy in the times of Moses and Joshua, 13; its form aristocratical after them, 23; kingly government set up among them, 111; said to be desired on account of the corruption in their courts by Samuel's sons, 112.

Hebrew language, the Jews confident it was the original language, 553; the opinion of others about its antiquity, 554, 555; how the original language was formed, 556; the names of most ancient persons derived from the Hebrew, *ibid.*; some writers allow not this argument to be conclusive, 557; to what people the Hebrew language belonged after the dispersion at Babel, 563; the Hebrew the language of the Canaanites, *ibid.*; the excellencies this language is said to have, 565.

Hebrew character, in what letters the sacred books were written, 566; whether in the Hebrew character, or in the old Samaritan, *ibid.*; the opinion of Scaliger and others about this question, *ibid.*; the arguments on both sides, 568—571.

Hebrew points or vowels, 572; a great controversy whether they are of

the same antiquity and authority with the consonants, *ibid.*; the several hypotheses on this subject, 572—574; the arguments on both sides considered, 574, &c.; arguments for the antiquity of the points, 574—576; three sorts of arguments against the antiquity of the points, 576—592.

Hebrews, the meaning of that word, 68; from whence derived, *ibid.*; "Hebrew of the Hebrews," a name of honour, 73; their genealogies, 86.

Hellenists, who were Hellenistic Jews, 74, 75.

Herod, the temple rebuilt by him, 357; a more magnificent structure than Zerubbabel's, *ibid.*; writers differ in the accounts of it, *ibid.*; the time when built, 361; utterly destroyed by the Romans, 362.

Herodians, not mentioned by the Jewish historians, 327; mentioned in three passages of the New Testament, *ibid.*; whether a political party or a religious sect; these two opinions considered, 328—330.

High places, a blemish on some pious kings for not destroying them, 396.

High-priest, a type of Christ, 143; his unction typical of the extraordinary gifts and influences of the Spirit, *ibid.*; by some peculiarities different from the priests, 170; must marry none but a virgin, *ibid.*; must not mourn for the death of his kindred, 171; forbid to uncover his head, *ibid.*; must not rend his clothes in mourning for the dead, 173; presided over the inferior priests, 176; his peculiar province, 177; his deputy or sagan, *ibid.*; rites chiefly performed by him on the day of expiation, 521; entered that day into the holy of holies, 522; ordered to sprinkle the blood eastward, 524; a type of Christ, *ibid.*; the expiatory sacrifices offered by him typical of the true expiation Christ made, 525, 526.

Holy of holies, beyond the second veil of the tabernacle, 346.

Hosea, whether that prophet's taking a wife of whoredom was a real fact or a symbolical vision, 251, 252.

Hours, the day divided into hours, 404; an hour the twelfth part of an artificial day, *ibid.*; various opinions about the greater and lesser hours, 406; a difficulty about the hour of Christ's crucifixion considered, 406, 407; what were the hours of prayer observed by the Jews, 408.

I.

Jacob's prophecy about the sceptre's departing from Judah considered, 51; the literal meaning of the words, 51—53; the import of the prophecy, 53, 54.

Idolatry, the reasons of its being performed in groves, 392; this practice began with the worship of demons and departed souls, 393.

Jephthah's vow, 31; a great controversy whether he sacrificed his daughter, *ibid.*; what alleged for her being devoted to perpetual virginity, 32—39; arguments alleged for Jephthah's sacrificing his daughter, 39—41.

Jeroboam's filling the hand of the priests explained, 170; his idolatry in setting up the two golden calves, 349, 350.

Jerusalem besieged, and the king, nobles, and thousands of people carried captive, 43; sacked and burnt by the Babylonian general, 44; its inhabitants massacred by Antiochus Epiphanes, 48.

Jerusalem, its nine gates, 384; the sheep-gate, its situation, 384, 385; the pool of Bethesda, its cures miraculous, 385—389; its two principal gates built by Solomon, 389.

Jeshurun, why Moses and Israel were called by that name, 19, 20.

Jethro, his advice to Moses about judging the people, 16; whether an ecclesiastical or civil person, 129.

Jews, settled in their own land after the captivity, 44, 45; under the authority of the king of Persia, *ibid.*; though tributary, enjoyed their own religion, and were governed by their own laws, 47; favoured by Alexander the Great, 48; persecuted by Antiochus Epiphanes, 48, 49; destroy the

Heathen altars, 49; enjoy their liberty for a long time, 50; conquered by the Romans, *ibid.*

Jews and Gentiles, the meaning of that expression, 67.

Imposition of hands, used at consecration into an office, 199, 200.

Inauguration of the kings of the Hebrews, 119—127; the anointing and other ceremonies attending it, *ibid.*

Inspiration, a way of revelation to the prophets, 253; was calm and gentle, 254.

John the Baptist and Zacharias to be reckoned among the prophets, 241.

Jonadab the son of Rechab, zealous against idolatry, 294, 295: what rules of living he gave to the Rechabites, his children, *ibid.*

Joseph, whether a Nazarite by being separated from his brethren, 285.

Josephus, his opinion about Cyrus's restoring Israel, 45; prefers Daniel to the rest of the prophets, 240; his bad character of the Sadducees, 315; his account of the largeness of the stones of the temple not probable, 358.

Joshua, by divine appointment Moses's successor, 15, 20, 22; what his name signifies, 20, 21; conducts Israel into Canaan, *ibid.*; not equal in honour to Moses, 22.

Isaiah, whether the account of his walking naked was a real fact, or a symbolical dream, 249.

Israelites, the Lord their King and their God, 13, 16; two sorts, Hebrews and Israelites, 73; whence they had riches to build the tabernacle, 337.

Jubilee, the grand sabbatical year, 537; celebrated every forty-ninth or fiftieth year, *ibid.*; the etymology of the word, *ibid.*; the learned not agreed whether kept the forty-ninth or fiftieth year, 538—540; proclaimed through the whole land, 540; a year of general release of slaves and prisoners, 541; in which all estates returned to their former proprietors, *ibid.*; some of the Heathens copied after it, *ibid.*; its design political in several respects, *ibid.*; typical of spiritual liberty from the bondage of sin and Satan, 542.

Judah, his patriarchal authority considered, 10, 11.

Judas Maccabæus, the motto on his standard, 49; purified the temple from the pollution of Antiochus Epiphanes, 356.

Judas of Galilee, raises a political faction, 327.

Judges, the form of government under them, 23; appointed on particular occasions, 28—30; fifteen in number from Othniel to Samuel, 31.

K.

Karraites, their opinions, 298; wherein they differed from other Jews, 299, 300.

Katholikin, Immarkalin, and Gizbarin, these three sorts of officers superior to common priests, 180.

King, a king granted to the Israelites under several limitations, 113; the choice to be reserved to God himself, *ibid.*; is to be a native Israelite, 114; was not to multiply horses, *ibid.*; was commanded not to multiply wives, *ibid.*; forbid to multiply silver and gold, 115; enjoined to write a copy of the law, 116; was bound to govern by law, 117; and with lenity and kindness, 119; invested with the kingly dignity by anointing, 119; the state and magnificence of the Jewish kings, 127, 128.

Knave, the derivation and meaning of this word formerly, 72.

Kohathites, Gershonites, and Merarites, what particulars of the tabernacle were committed to the care of each of them, 185, 186.

L.

Language, what was the original, and how formed, 553, 554; the

Jews affirm the Hebrew to be the first language, 553; other nations put in their claims, 555; the eastern writers give the preference to the Syriac, 556; the confusion of languages at Babel, 559—561; the excellency of the Hebrew language, 565.

Laws, how enacted and published among the Israelites, 14; the laws and limitations concerning their kings, 113.

Le Clerc, his opinion about Cain's mark, 4; what he says about the original language is near the truth, 558.

Leprosy, a very bad disease in Syria, 107.

Levites, a lower order of the priests, 184; the honour of attending divine service assigned to them instead of the first-born, 185; distinguished into three classes, *ibid.*; afterward divided into twenty-four courses, *ibid.*; at what age they were to enter on their office, 186; how they were instructed, *ibid.*; the different services of the several classes of the priests, 187; vocal and instrumental music performed by them, 190; magistrates of different ranks chiefly chosen out of the tribe of Levi, 197; the prophetic curse turned into a blessing, 197, 201; at what age the Levites were consecrated, *ibid.*; the ceremonies used at their consecration, 198—200; the places of their residence, and their subsistence, 200—206; the number of cities allotted for them, *ibid.*

Libertus and Libertinus, the meaning of that distinction, 366.

Love-feasts, derived from the Jewish feasts upon sacrifices, 419; the time when they were kept, 420, 421; the ceremony of washing the feet of the guests, 424.

M.

Maccabees change the government of the Jews, 49.

Maimonides, his opinion about the sin of the Israelites in asking a king, 112.

Malachi, commonly reckoned the last prophet, 240; how long he prophesied before Christ's coming, *ibid.*

Mark set upon Cain by God, conjectures about it, 3.

Masora, called by the Jews the hedge and fence of the law, 275.

Masorites, a lower sort of scribes, 273; what was their office, *ibid.*; doubtful when they first arose, 274; their work regarded the letter of the Hebrew text, 275; they numbered the verses, words, and letters of the text, *ibid.*; and marked the irregularities of the text, 276; were the authors of the marginal corrections, *ibid.*

Mattathias destroys the Heathen altars and idolaters, 49.

Maundrel, his surprising account of the size of some stones, 358, note.

Meals, Jewish, not many, nor costly, 418.

Meat-offerings and drink-offerings, of what they consisted, 232; how they were offered and consumed, 233.

Mede, Mr. Joseph, makes the synagogues and proseuchæ to be different places, 381.

Melchizedek, a priest as well as a king, 131.

Mercy-seat and cherubim, 347.

Metempsychosis, an account of that opinion, 305.

Mishna, traditionary precepts in that book, 303, 304; eighteen collects particularly mentioned, 371.

Monarchy, the supreme authority lodged in a single person, 23, note.

Months, with the Hebrews, take their name from the moon, 412; when this regulation took place, *ibid.*; in Noah's time the year consisted of twelve months, *ibid.*; the absurdity of some who would compute the age of the antediluvians, not by solar years, but by months, 413; months were counted with names by the Jews before the captivity, *ibid.*; when the new moon was

seen, their month began, 416; cycles used for fixing their months and years, *ibid.*

Mordecai, why he refused to pay respect to Haman, 547; some think because he was an Amalekite, *ibid.*; probably a kind of divine honour was ordered to be paid, *ibid.*

Moses, the sole judge and viceroy of the Israelites, 12. 19; called king of Jeshurun, 19; a famous prophecy about the great Messiah resembling Moses, 22; his descendants only common Levites, 184; an evidence he was not the author of the laws given to Israel, *ibid.*; why he may be called the greatest prophet, 257.

Mourning, signs thereof among the Jews and other nations, 172—176.

Music, first introduced into the Jewish service by Moses, 188; improved by David, *ibid.*; restored by Hezekiah, *ibid.*; whether music is to be used in Christian worship, 189; that used in the temple was both vocal and instrumental, *ibid.*; the musical instruments used in the sacred service, 190—193; instrumental music in Christian worship not approved by the ancient fathers, 193; at what time it was introduced, 194; where used at present, *ibid.*; disapproved by Luther and the synod of Middleburgh, *ibid.*; the Church of England remonstrates against such music, *ibid.*

Music, of use to compose the mind, and free people from melancholy, 244.

N.

Naaman, the Syrian, a Gentile idolater, 104; cured of his leprosy by the direction of Elisha, *ibid.*; renounced his idolatry, *ibid.*; remarks on his bowing before Rimmon, 105; supposed to have erected an hospital for lepers, 107; the only miraculous cure of leprosy recorded before the coming of Christ, *ibid.*

Nadab and Abihu struck dead, 134; what was their crime, *ibid.*

Nazarene, that text, of Christ's being called one, explained, 291—293.

Nazarites, from whence the name is derived, 285; of two sorts, for life, or for a limited time, 286; what they were required to do, 286. 288; women as well as men might bind themselves by this vow, 289; the institution partly religious, partly civil, 290; a Nazarite was a type of Christ, 292.

Nethinim, why so called, and their office, 207.

New Testament, various opinions about the dialect thereof, 76; instances of Latin phrases in it, 77.

Night, divided by the Hebrews into four watches, 403.

Nimrod, an oppressive tyrant, 6.

Noah, pronounced a curse upon Canaan, 6; his honour and authority, 7; endued with a prophetic spirit, *ibid.*; seven precepts given him, 100.

O.

Offerings, sin-offering, burnt-offering, peace-offering, 168.

Officers of the children of Israel in Egypt, for what end, 12.

Oil, with which the high-priest was anointed, 141; of what compounded, and how made, *ibid.*

Ointment on Aaron's head to his garment, explained, 151.

Old Testament, in what language written, 566; chiefly in Hebrew, *ibid.*; a small part in Chaldee, *ibid.*

Oracles, given to the Jews by an audible voice, 13.

P.

Passover, the original of that word, 452; the time and month when this feast was kept, 453; the two names of the month wherein kept, *ibid.*; the distinction between the passover and the feast of unleavened bread,

455; the opinion of the critics about the time our Saviour kept the passover, 455—457; reasons to show that Christ kept it at the usual time, *ibid.*; some passages of Scripture relating to the time of keeping the passover, explained, 458, 459; the matter of the paschal feast, a lamb without blemish, 460—462; a male of the first year, *ibid.*; and taken from the flock four days before it was killed, 463; the place where it was to be killed, 464; the sprinkling of the blood on the side-posts and doors of the houses, 465; it was to be roasted, 467; to be eaten standing in the posture of travellers, with loins girt and shoes on their feet, and staves in their hands, 468, 469; to be eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, 469, 470; nothing was to remain till the morning, 471; they were to keep in their own houses all night, 472; the passover had a typical reference to Christ in various particulars, 472. 477.

Patriarchal form of government, 1; an instance of it in Adam, *ibid.*; its continuance among the Israelites, 2; instances of it, 6. 9, 10.

Paul, the apostle, his offering a sacrifice how accounted for, 17; his not knowing the high-priest accounted for, 163.

Peace-offerings, the intention of these sacrifices, 228; in what manner offered, 229.

Pentecost, feast of, the second great festival of the Jews, 483; called the "feast of weeks," *ibid.*; how the rabbies computed the seven weeks, 484; on what day of the week this feast fell, when the Holy Ghost was sent down on the apostles, 484, 485; by the computation of the Scribes it was on the first day of the week, 486; was called the "feast of harvest," and why, *ibid.*; and also the "day of the first-fruits," 487; why leavened bread was used at pentecost, when forbid at the passover, *ibid.*; this feast called the "fiftieth," and why, 488; and also the day of the giving of the law, *ibid.*; the rabbies call it "gnatsereth," and why, 489.

Pharisees, from whence so named, 301; uncertain when this sect sprung up, *ibid.*; their opinion of holding the tradition of the elders, 308; their doctrinal and practical points, 304; held the doctrine of the resurrection in a proper sense, 306; their various errors proceeded from their regard to traditions, *ibid.*; were busied about trifles, and neglected the weightier matters of the law, 307; made broad their phylacteries, 308; enlarged the borders of their garments, 309; their unreasonable opposition to Christ, 312.

Phylacteries, used by the Pharisees, 308; what they were, and for what used, *ibid.*; what meant by making them broad, 309.

Pope of Rome, the jubilee of the Jews imitated by him, 542.

Porters, their office about the temple, 194.

Prayer, a part of the synagogue service, 371; what hours of prayer were observed by the Jews, 408; what hours observed by the Mahometans, 409.

Praying or prophesying, by a woman, that passage of Scripture considered, 238.

Preaching to the people, and expounding the Scriptures, one part of the synagogue service, 375.

Prideaux, his opinion about the liturgies and collects of the Jews, 371; two inferences made by him for the consideration of Dissenters, 372; these inferences considered, 373—375.

Priest, the ceremony of the high-priest's consecration, 138, 139; clothed with pontifical garments, and then anointed, *ibid.*; whether there was a priest anointed for war, 140; enrobed with eight sacerdotal garments, 144.

Priests, what sort of officers they were among the Hebrews, 129; to whom it belonged to execute the office of a priest, 130; this office allotted to Aaron and his sons, 132; the difficulty of some persons officiating as priests considered, *ibid.*; what might be the reason of the priesthood being transferred from Eleazar's to Ithamar's family, 136, 137; their washing,

anointing, and clothing considered, 138—149; sacrifices at their consecration, 168; some parts of their office, 176, 177; divided into twenty-four companies serving by rotation, 181; four of them returned from the captivity, 184; how the priests were maintained, 201.

Priests and Levites, their office and allotments, 16, 17.

Prophets, three words by which named in Scripture, 234; these names in Hebrew particularly considered, 234—236; their duty and business, 236; in a proper sense, those who had a revelation of secret things from God, and declared them to others, *ibid.*; that title given to others, 237; the reputed number of real prophets and prophetesses from Abraham to Malachi, 239; the most essential qualification of a prophet was true piety, 242; the mind must be in a proper frame for receiving the prophetic spirit, *ibid.*; visions and dreams one way of divine revelation to them, 244; the criteria by which they knew their revelations came from God, 245—248; whether their symbolical actions were real facts or visions, 248—253; ecstasies the sign of a false prophet, 254; the import of prophets being moved by the Holy Ghost, 255; and of the spirits of the prophets being subject to the prophets, 256; things revealed to the prophets by voices, 257; why their writings called "a more sure word of prophecy," 259; their schools, 262; who called the "sons of the prophets," 263.

Proselytes, two sorts of them, 89; the privileges of the "proselytes of righteousness," 90; the manner of their admission, according to the rabbies, 90—94; the "proselytes of the gate," their admission and privileges, 97—99; those proselytes did not exist as the rabbies mention, 110.

Proseuchæ, oratories or places of prayer, 379; the word proseucha considered, *ibid.*; a note of Mr. Jones upon that word, 380; different from the synagogues, according to Mede and Prideaux, 381; the proof in favour of this notion not very strong, 382.

Purim, the feast of, 544; instituted by Mordecai for the Jews' deliverance from Haman's conspiracy, *ibid.*; its bad effects the same as other human institutions, *ibid.*; when and how kept, 545; when and in what king's reign this affair happened, 545—547.

Publicans, appointed by the Romans to gather the Jewish taxes, 62; three sorts of taxes, 63; three sorts of publicans, 63, 64; the reason of the general hatred of them, 65.

Pythagoras, said to have sacrificed an hecatomb, 323.

Pythagoreans, their swearing by the number four wrote by ten dots, 322.

Pythagoreans and Platonists, their opinions of the metempsychosis, 305.

R.

Rabbi, when that title was first assumed, 279; the title conferred with great ceremony, 280; a question whether our Lord had that title, 281; why he forbad his disciples to be called by that title, 283; what meant by the titles of Rab, Rabbi, and Rabban, 283, 284.

Rabbinists and Karraites differ in several things, 299.

Ram, offered at the consecration of the priest, 168; the blood put on various parts of their bodies, 169; it signified that all must be sanctified and accepted by the blood of Christ, 170.

Reading the Scriptures, a part of the synagogue service, 370.

Rechabites were Kenites, descended from Jethro, 293; their vows of not drinking wine or possessing vineyards, 294.

Righteous and good man, these words explained, 297.

Romans conquer Judea, and reduce it to a Roman province, 50.

S.

Sabbath, to be observed by the proselytes as well as the Jews, 98.

Sabbath, the different acceptations of that word, 428, 429; proofs of its institution after the creation, 430—432; probable that the Jewish was kept the day before the patriarchal sabbath, 433; the institution of the Jewish sabbath, 433, 434; marked out by manna not raining on that day, *ibid.*; kept on a different day from the paradisiacal sabbath, *ibid.*; a memorial of their deliverance out of Egypt, 435; a sign between God and Israel, 437; the law of the sabbath enforced by capital punishments, *ibid.*; what duties belonged to it, 438; what the keeping of it holy imports, 438, 439; what blessings the word "remember" hath a respect to, *ibid.*; they were to abstain from all manner of work, 439; were not to do or find their own pleasure, 440; self-defence forbid on this day by some, which occasioned a thousand Jews to be slain, 441; thirty-nine negative precepts about things not to be done on this day, *ibid.*; what it is to sanctify the sabbath, 442—444; the ends of the institution partly political, partly religious, 444; the political, that servants and beasts of burden might be refreshed, *ibid.*; the religious, to commemorate God's work of creation, 445; and deliverance from Egyptian bondage, 446; and to prepare for heavenly blessedness, *ibid.*; was a type of the heavenly rest, 447.

Sabbatical year, or seventh year's rest, 527; distinguished by several names, *ibid.*; the peculiar observances of that year, *ibid.*; from whence the computation of the year began, 528; at what season it began, 529; a total cessation this year from agriculture, 529—531; the product of the ground to be enjoyed in common, 531; the remission of debts from one Israelite to another, 532; whether the Hebrew servants were released in the sabbatical year, 533; the public reading of the law at this time, 535; the reason on which the law was founded, partly civil, partly religious, 536; this year typified the spiritual rest Christ will give to his people, *ibid.*;

Sacrifices, a double use of them, 17; by whom they were offered, 130—133; sacrifices at the consecration of the priests, 168.

Sacrifices, practised in the first ages of the world, 208; the opinion of some that sacrifices were an human institution, 210; the meaning of some passages of Scripture about sacrifices, 210, 211; evidences that sacrifices were originally of divine institution, 212—214; but afterward greatly corrupted, both as to their subjects and objects, 214; they include all the offerings made to God, 215; taken in a large and a strict sense, *ibid.*; were strictly either of beasts or birds, *ibid.*; were an acknowledgment of receiving good things from God, *ibid.*; were a means of repentance and humiliation for sin, *ibid.*; they typified the promised sacrifice of atonement by the Son of God, *ibid.*; the victim was substituted in the room of the transgressor, 216; and God in mercy took the victim as an expiation for the offender, 217; what was offered in sacrifice was to be perfect in its kind, 221; distinguished into four kinds, *ibid.*; the burnt-offerings were wholly consumed, *ibid.*; sin-offerings, the law about them laid down in Scripture, 223; trespass-offerings greatly resembled the sin-offerings, 227; peace-offerings were one sort of sacrifices, 228; public sacrifices offered morning and evening, 231; a double offering every sabbath-day, *ibid.*; extraordinary sacrifices offered at the public feasts, *ibid.*; were also offered for particular persons, *ibid.*; distinguished likewise into animal and vegetable, 232; meat-offerings and drink-offerings offered, *ibid.*; the Jews rarely refused to offer their proper sacrifices, 233; the difficulty reconciled of being offered in other places besides the national altar, 395.

Sadducees differed much from the Pharisees, 384; the etymology of their name, 314; the most wicked of the Jews, 315; their doctrines, *ibid.*; deny the resurrection, *ibid.*; their bad character by Josephus, *ibid.*; what sacred book they admitted, *ibid.*; are said to be the richest sect, 317.

Sagan, the high-priest's deputy, 177; what alleged for their divine institution, 180.

Sailing, formerly reckoned dangerous after the autumnal equinox, 511.
Salutations, why Elisha forbid Gehazi to give a salutation, 422; why our Lord said to his disciples, "salute no man," 423.
Samaritans, what they were originally, 317; their religion, 318; the mutual animosity between them and the Jews, 319.
Sanhedrim, arguments alleged for its antiquity, 25; but probably only in the time of the Maccabees, 27; what methods they used to find the time of the new moon, 416.
Scaliger, his opinion of the sacred books being wrote in the Samaritan character, 566; his severe names to writers of a different opinion, *ibid.*
Schools of the prophets, 384; and sons of the prophets, 385; schools and academies among the Jews, 377; the pupils sat at their tutors' feet, *ibid.*; these schools different from the synagogues, 378.
Scribes, two sorts of them, 266; what the office of the civil Scribes, 266—268; what of the ecclesiastical Scribes, 268, 269; they were the preaching clergy among the Jews, 270; the difference between their teaching and that of Christ, 270, 271; what meant by the phrase, "Scribes and Pharisees," 272; were of great power and authority in the state, 273; the origin of their office, *ibid.*
Septuagint, some say that the Hebrew copies these ancient interpreters used, had no points, 589.
Shechinah, or miraculous light, a token of the special presence of God, 351.
Shiites and *Sonnites*, sectaries among the Mahometans, 300.
Shiloh, in Jacob's prophecy, explained, 52.
Shophetim and *Shoterim*, the distinction between them, 196.
Shuckford, his opinion about Cain's mark, 4; his hypothesis about the confusion of languages, 561.
Simeon and Levi, a curse denounced on them, 10.
Simeon, whether good old Simeon was president of the Sanhedrim, 280.
Sin-offerings, laws and rites about them, 223; on what occasions offered, 224—226.
Solomon, whether guilty of idolatry, 36.
Sortes Homericæ and "Sortes Virgilianæ," a sort of divination, 260.
Sortes Sanctorum, formerly used, but afterwards condemned, 261, 262.
Sprinkling of blood and oil upon the high-priest's garments, explained, 152, 153.
Strangers "of the gate" among the Israelites, 97; should not blaspheme God, and should keep the sabbath, 98; thousands of strangers in Solomon's time, 99.
Subdeacons of the Church of Rome, imitating the Nethinim, 208.
Suburbs of the cities of the Levites, the extent of them, 201.
Sun, worship of, supposed to be set up by Cain, 3.
Sykes, his Essay on Sacrifices considered, 208, note; makes all sacrifices to be federal rites, 215; his arguments against vicarious expiation confuted, 217—220.
Synagogues, used in two senses, 363; denoted commonly places of public worship, *ibid.*; a great number of them said to be in Jerusalem, *ibid.*; questioned whether there were any before the Babylonish captivity, 364; in what manner the people met after their settlement in the land of Canaan, 365; what was the synagogue of the Libertines, 366—368; queried how Christ and his apostles "taught" in the synagogues, 368; what meant by "a ruler" of the synagogue, 369; and by "the officer" who prayed, *ibid.*; the worship in them was by reading the Scriptures, prayer, and preaching, *ibid.*; the law divided into fifty-four sections, 370; the synagogues used also for holding courts of justice, 376; that passage of Scripture, of coming into the assembly or synagogue in goodly apparel, considered, 376, 377.

T.

Tabernacle, the Divine presence manifested there, 13; minutely described by Moses, 333; three tabernacles before Solomon's temple, 333, 334; that made by Moses, according to God's command, considered, 334; the heathens had tabernacles, *ibid.*; a moveable fabric, 336; an expensive building, *ibid.*; the particular model of the tabernacle, 338—340; the covering of it, 340; the inside of it, 341; the court, 341, 342; the altar of burnt-offering, 342; the fire to be kept constantly burning, 344; the brazen laver, *ibid.*; the altar of incense, 345; the golden candlestick, and table of shew-bread, 346; the holy of holies and the ark, 346, 347; the form of the mercy-seat and cherubim, 347; the tabernacle and its furniture typical of spiritual blessings, 352.

Tabernacles, feast of, the third great festival of the Jews, 490; why so called, *ibid.*; called also "the feast of in-gathering," *ibid.*; that properly different from "the feast of tabernacles," 491; during this feast they were to dwell in tents and booths made of branches of trees, 491—494; the practice of the Jews as to those branches, *ibid.*; the first and last day kept as sabbaths, 494; an extraordinary ceremony about drawing water out of the pool of Siloam, 495; various reasons why celebrated at this time of the year, 496, 497; had a typical reference to the incarnation and birth of our Saviour, 498.

Talmudists, their account of the inscription on the high-priest's breast-plate, 160.

Taxes, Jewish, occasional and stated, 55—60; various sorts levied by the Romans, 60.

Temple at Jerusalem more magnificent than the tabernacle, 352; one built by Solomon, and another by Zerubbabel, *ibid.*; wherein the glory of the latter was greater than the former, 353, 356; stood on Mount Zion, 353; its expense prodigious, 354; built in the same form with the tabernacle, *ibid.*; the first temple destroyed by the king of Babylon, 355; the time of its standing, *ibid.*; the second temple built by Zerubbabel, *ibid.*; much inferior to the first, 356; the second temple wanted five remarkable things, 356, 357; profaned by Antiochus, and again purified by Judas Maccabæus, 357; the temple rebuilt by Herod, 358; its great circumference, 359; the first court thereof that of the Gentiles, *ibid.*; then the court of the Israelites, *ibid.*; excommunicated persons not excluded from the temple, 390.

Temple-music, when first introduced, 188; what instruments used, 190—193.

Therapeutæ, who they were, 321.

Theocracy among the Israelites, 13; instances of God's being their king, 14; was to be consulted from time to time, 16.

Tithes, the Levites' subsistence chiefly from them, 202—204; why they were thus supported, 205; why that proportion of a tenth, rather than any other, was appointed, 206.

Trespass-offerings resembled sin-offerings, 227; their difference, *ibid.*; the opinions of learned men about this, 227, 228.

Trumpets, blown when the year of jubilee was proclaimed, 188, 189; were sounded by the priests, 190.

Trumpets and new moons, feast of, kept on the first day of every month, 501; the sacrifices prescribed on this occasion, *ibid.*; new moons and sabbaths, days of public worship, 502; the uncertainty of fixing the new moon, 503; the manner wherein it is kept by the modern Jews, 504; why sacrifices were offered at this season, 505; the sin-offering then offered, and remarks upon the design of it, *ibid.*; the new moon in the month Tisri

observed with solemnity, 506; the trumpets blown from morning to evening, *ibid.*; the learned divided about the reason of this festival, *ibid.*; the design of blowing the trumpets, 507; what the sounding of the trumpet is a memorial of, 508; what notion the modern Jews have about this day, 509.

Tyrannus, who he was, and the etymology of the name, 378.

U.

Unleavened bread, feast of, followed the passover, and was kept seven days, 477; the passover distinct from this feast, but the name of either used for both, 478; during this feast no leavened bread to be eaten, or to be in their houses, 479; the penalty for eating leavened bread, 480; the first and last days to be kept holy as sabbaths, 481; an offering of a sheaf of the first-fruits to be made, *ibid.*; the moral and typical signification of this offering, 482.

Urim and Thummim, the signification of these words, 158; various opinions about them, 159—162.

V.

Vessels for keeping the oil used for anointing the kings, of two sorts, 121.

Vestal virgins, some of their customs borrowed from the Jewish Levites, 187.

Vestments, sacerdotal, peculiar to the high-priest, 149; provided at the expense of the people, 163; their moral and typical signification, 166.

Viri stationarii, what the Jewish doctors say of them, 206.

Visions, one of the ways of divine revelation to the prophets, 244, 245; the criteria whereby their revelations were known to come from God, 245—248; whether several symbolical actions of the prophets are an history of real facts, or only visions, 248—253.

W.

Washing, Christ washing his disciples' feet an extraordinary case, 424; designed to instruct them in humility and benevolence, 425.

Watches, the night divided by the Hebrews into four of them, 403.

Waving the sacrifice, of two kinds, 198.

Weeks, Jewish, of two sorts, 409; the one ordinary, the other extraordinary, *ibid.*; the ordinary made by God himself from the beginning, *ibid.*; hence the seventh day has been held sacred, *ibid.*; a passage in Genesis considered in relation to weeks, *ibid.*; time divided by Noah and Laban by sevens, 411; the extraordinary or prophetical weeks, *ibid.*; the amount of the prophetical weeks of Daniel, *ibid.*

Wise men, to whom this appellation was given, 264

Woman, what offering to bring after child-bearing, 222.

Women singers, admitted into the temple choir, 188.

World, some conclude it will last six thousand years, 536.

Y.

Year, Jewish, partly lunar, partly solar, 414; the manner of reducing their lunar years to the solar, *ibid.*; the distinction of the civil and sacred year, *ibid.*; when each of them began, *ibid.*; what computations of time they used, 415—417; a new beginning of the year appointed by God at the Israelites' coming out of Egypt, and why, 417.

Z.

Zadoc and Abiathar, partners in the priesthood in David's reign, 135.
Zechariah, four fasts mentioned by that prophet, 549; these not appointed by the law of Moses, *ibid.*
Zerubbabel, chosen governor of Judah, 45.

THE END.

PRINTED BY W. BAYNES, JUN., BARTHOLOMEW CLOSE.